

THE
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1867.

ART. I.—SCRIPTURE INSPIRATION.

The Inspiration of Holy Scripture: its Nature and Proof.
Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin.
By WILLIAM LEE, A. M., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.
New York: Carter & Brothers.

Essays and Reviews. New York: Appletons.

Replies to Essays and Reviews. New York: Appletons.

Aids to Faith: a Series of Theological Essays. Appletons.

A Collection of Theological Essays from Various Authors, with
an Introduction by GEO. R. NOYES, D. D., Prof. of Sacred Lit-
erature in Harvard University. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

Commentary on Matthew and Mark. By WILLIAM NAST, D. D.
Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock.

The Greek Testament, with Notes by DEAN ALFORD. New York:
Harper & Brothers.

The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry. By ISAAC TAYLOR. New
York: Rudd & Carleton.

The Radical; a Monthly Magazine devoted to Religion. Boston.
Essays. By RALPH WALDO EMERSON. Ticknor & Fields.

THE inspiration of the Scriptures is the corner-stone of Christian doctrine. Without it the forms of true faith would crumble and disappear, for they could have no ground for their support. Appeals to consciousness, or tradition, or any other tribunal, would be instantly met by counter appeals to different declarations of consciousness and tradition, and the mind would drift powerless among the contending ice-floats of human imagination, feeling, and opinion.

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XIX.—21

An inquiry, therefore, into the ground and character of this inspiration, is one of the most important topics that can address the mind of man. Two branches this inquiry naturally assumes :

I. Considerations, *a priori*, in favor of inspiration.

II. Its real nature and degree.

First. What grounds have we for considering inspiration necessary in any divine system of faith ?

The basis of all truth is twofold: that revealed to the consciousness, and that revealed to the senses. Nature, in the earth and the universe, is a reality, undisturbed by the unrealism of Berkeley and Schopenhauer. The eye, and other organs of communication between the soul and its dwelling-place, transmit convictions of the reality of the objects they recognize, as positive, as unanswerable, as those which arise from the central depths of the spirit's own being. They speak of that which they do know, and the soul unhesitatingly receives their testimony.

On the other hand, the spirit of man testifieth to itself. In its own secret and intercommunion it asserts certain things as true. Its own existence, independent of, and superior to, the body, is perhaps the most central of these spiritual truths. It is the vital point. Were it not for that, the soul would be swallowed up by the body. We should have no selfhood, no spiritual sense, no moral nor conscious nature. It is probable that such is the fact in respect to the spirit of the beast that goeth downward. It is not a self-discerning spirit. It looks to the body as the center of its life, works blindly the will of the bodily appetites, and is absorbed by the fleshly nature. It rises not into the realm of conscious being, and is not, therefore, reasoning, moral, immortal. Born with the body, it obeys its behests as faithfully as the waves the moon.

Who ever saw a beast, even the most intelligent, seek to restrain its appetite from gratification? It will adopt every means, on the contrary, to secure its indulgence, as the choked river among the hills will wind in every manner to find an outlet. And if the appetite is unsatisfied, so far from repressing it, through every tie of duty, love, or obedience, of parental or filial instinct, it will break, even as the same obstructed river madly

tears its path through ripening fields, through homes of culture and affection, regardless alike of happiness and of life, so that it may obey the domination of its own imperious nature and reach the haven of its desires.

These lower creatures, then, lack this spiritual counselor against the pressure of instinct, this reviser and represser of brutality. Their spirits are jackals to the beastly lion of the body. Man, on the contrary, has a soul that declares to him the reality of its own existence; its relations to the body, in which it condescends to abide for a little season, as its guide, companion, and master; its relations to the past and future, to the visible and invisible, to the temporal and eternal, to himself, his fellow-creatures, and, far above all, and infinitely above the possibility of brute spirit, to God—creator, preserver, deliverer.

Beyond this highest height there is a higher height the soul of man attains. Not alone does it discover God. It converses with him. The intimacy of Adam and his Creator, broken off by sin, is renewed in Christ. His Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits. The soul sees, hears, talks with God. The only possible meaning of prayer is this communion. It would be mockery and insanity did not God and the human soul then meet and converse together.

The fact, therefore, of the soul's existence and movements is as well founded as that of the existence of the material universe. It knows its own workings as certainly as it does that of the body it inhabits. It sees God with the same clearness and assurance that it sees the earth and sky.

Now Christianity being the work of the same God who created the soul and the body, the material earth and the spiritual heavens, it is established on precisely the same foundations that these rest upon. It has an earthly body, it has a spiritual body. Being designed for man, it is especially adapted to his twofold nature. It has an inward and an outward being: a body and a soul.

*'Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet.'*

Its chief revelation is, however, directly to the heart and the mind, without any connection with outward media. Without reading a book, or hearing a voice, or seeing a form, the penitent soul may draw nigh unto God; may be conscious of his

justifying grace, of a peace that passeth even its own understanding, of a joy in communion that is inexpressible in its tenderness and glory.

This inward expression of Christianity surpasses the outward as greatly as spirit excels matter. It is the profound, the indestructible life of Christianity. Its outward forms may be suppressed by persecution, its written word may be hidden from the eyes of the believer in the vail of an unknown tongue, or by the power of hostile rulers. Yet spirit will blend with Spirit, the creature converse with the Creator, and Christianity still live, a fountain sealed but not dried up; a fountain, fresh, sweet, eternally upspringing, and ready, when the seal is broken, to break forth in channels, and make the earth where it flows a paradise. Christianity, therefore, in its ultimate solution and central vitality, like prayer, is

"The soul's sincere desire,
Uttered or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast."

But God has not chosen to confine himself to this mode of manifestation. He has provided this gospel a body as it hath pleased him. He hath put his religion into a form apprehensible by the out-looking faculties of the soul; a form that stands among other visible works of man and of God as clear, authoritative, and divine as the mountains among the man-made cities that crouch at their feet, or as the ocean around the man-driven ships that rock on its waves. It is thus ordained of God that if man dare deny the existence of His works he must, with the same breath, deny those of his own hands.

The same law rules in the higher realm of grace. Whoever shall deny the divinity of Christianity in its revealed forms, by the very force of his own nature is compelled, if rational and consistent, to deny the corresponding but infinitely inferior revelations of his own inward spiritual life.

In two ways the ideas of man permanently seek expression: in organization and in language. These are almost simultaneous in origin and development. His thoughts that breathe must be embodied in words that burn; a seemingly more, but really less intense expression of the inexpressible. They must

none the less take on the form of action. They must organize societies around their focus, or rather develop such organisms from this vital center. They must blossom into customs, habits, buildings, institutions, every form of outward beauty and efficiency. Thus the idea of the divine right of kings has found expression in books, palaces, pomp, and power. Thus the counter idea of the divine rights of man is becoming clothed upon with language, law, arms, and nationality.

Even so Christianity has a twofold expression of its ineffable fullness and vitality. It takes the shape of worship and of word; of Church or kingdom; and of language or literature. It puts on the goodly apparel of vestments. It flowers into the highest art of the painter and sculptor. It bursts forth in the wondrous majesty of architecture; in the tabernacle, in the temple, in the sublimer beauty of the cathedral. These are its outermost forms of worship. The inner and finer wrappings of this spirit are the bowed head, the lifted voice, the unspotted life, the active service of love.

Antichrist seeks to organize mankind into sects and constituencies. Christ organizes his disciples into a congregation or Church, which shall offset this mighty power of numbers. He calls this company, "the pillar and ground of the truth." Not the truth itself—that is spiritual, and cannot be affected by numbers—but its supporters and revealers. They represent its numerical or voting power. They are the popular tests of the divinity of the gospel. The suffrages of the race, without regard to color or condition, shall thus declare the sovereignty of Christ against that of Satan. Even if many of these voters are themselves bad men, utterly destitute of inward and real Christianity, like many wicked supporters of political truth, they acknowledge thus the truth of the gospel, whose renewing power they personally refuse. Thus many of the popes and their subjects, as well as the irreligious portion of Protestant communities, support the claims of Christ against idolatry and infidelity.

But while this general suffrage may concede his kingly rights, they cannot be truly said to be the body of the Christian soul. Only the true Church can be the true outgrowth. And only when this mass of individual adherents becomes thoroughly transformed by the power of the endless life within, will the

Church be the all-prevailing, all-perfect form and likeness of the indwelling God, the Holy Ghost.

But the Church is not its only outward revelation. Man-kind are affected by numbers; they are yet more by ideas. The Church, like the State, must be inspired and uplifted by thought. These ideas must take the form of language. They must enunciate law, sing praises, and mould themselves into biography and history. These revelations the Gospel makes of itself, and their combined form it calls the book—the word, the letter of God. Thus, when Satan might appeal to his multitude of worshipers for proof of his kingliness, Christ appeals to his as a superior proof of superior claims. When the enemy sets forth his falsehoods in the form of argument, creed, song, and story, his divine adversary is ready with this counter statement, argument, life, and law. He not only enters the forum and the hustings, he enters the schools and the libraries. If man dares to deny, as how often he has, the ability and act of divine composition, he will thus, by the same word, deny his own. For God's book was written and published ages before the first of his. The very book in which he may attempt to deny the possibility of a divine writing, proves the impossibility of his own; for all his powers of thought and of expression, his faculty of writing and printing, are from God himself, who can as easily do for his own ends of infinite greatness what he allows man to do for his objects of infinitesimal triviality. Thus the foundation of God standeth sure by the very necessity he has laid upon his enemies to build their own structures on the same foundations.

The Bible is therefore the second essential expression of Christianity. It is the body of Christian truth; the outer intellectual form of the inner life; the testimony to the world of that experience which every renewed nature receives directly from God. It is as essential to our present existence as is the body to our earthly existence. As the soul cannot act, nay, cannot remain in this world, without a body, no more can Christianity be a power in the earth and among men without an outer oracle. The sinful soul doth not discern the things of the Spirit. The world that lieth in the wicked one would deny and despise the testimonies of sanctified ones. Hence God enters their own arena, conforms to their own ways of

procedure, puts his polling booth alongside of theirs—his printing press, his school, his poetry, oratory, logic, philosophy, his heroes and heroines, his histories, constitutions, communities.

Therefore it becomes absolutely necessary that He should write a book. In it should he set forth such thoughts and facts as he may deem it desirable that man should know. As the author seeks to impress his convictions upon the reader, and does not accept the latter as a partner in his work, either as to the suggestion of topic or treatment, so the Author of this Book does not take counsel with his readers as to what or how he shall write, but is solely anxious to enlighten them with his own opinions expressed in his own way.

In his book we thus find him communicating directly with man. He gives him that most interesting of all histories to a human being, his genealogy. He adds that hardly less fascinating knowledge, the origin of the home he inhabits. What man desires not to know his first ancestor, and the first homestead of his family? How powerful is this passion even for the few generations through which but few can trace their stream of being. Had we not the Bible, the pages of Hesiod and Apollodorus, as well as the custom of all heathen rulers to ascribe their origin to their gods, show how great would be our curiosity, and how absurd the conclusions of our scrutiny.

Beginning with these most alluring subjects to the human mind, it instantly shows the divinity of its authorship by rising from the sphere of mere earthly science and family pride, into the relations of those souls to their Maker. "Let us make man in Our image. In the image of God made He him." It as instantly gives the absolute equality of every individual, despite all natural or enforced distinctions, in its next word: "Male and female created He them." From the high position as the children of God, he proceeds to show how they fell, and how they were rescued from its immediate consequences; introducing in this narrative the two great agencies, unseen and superior to man, that are concerned in his history; introducing also the mode by which the Divine deliverer shall rescue man through the interposition of Himself. Thus was set forth in the opening chapters the seven most important facts that man could need or wish to know: his origin, his birthplace, his dependence on God, his independence of his fellow, his

adversary, his fall, his Saviour. These three chapters introduce the volume. They are the proem of the epic, or the first chorus of the drama, which give a synopsis of the whole work. No matter how many years the Author may be in completing his work; no matter how many volumes it may ultimately include, they are all summed up in this introductory chapter. Thus Gibbon declared a purpose, in the first page of his history, that it took him twelve years to complete, and that covered thirteen centuries of time. Thus Adam Clarke began a task in 1794 that he did not fully finish in nearly forty years. Thus Bancroft and Herbert Spencer are engaged yet on intellectual works which their prefatory chapters lay out, and which have already absorbed nearly forty years of the life of the former,* and may yet a longer portion of that of the latter, ere they can say as did Gibbon, "I may now congratulate my deliverance from a long and laborious service." If a creature whose limit of labor rarely reaches half a century may thus grapple with undertakings which demand a quarter, or a half, or even all of that time to complete, is it not eminently easy for the Author of the Book, whose goings forth are from eternity, to occupy two or more thousands of years in elaborating the plan he sets forth in his introductory chapter?

That elaboration will include the history of this redemption as it discloses itself in the lives of individuals, of families, of nations, as it contends with opposing powers of error, as it exhibits itself in superhuman and supernatural events, or moulds itself into systems of worship and a code of laws. It will include also such truths respecting the nature and destiny of man, on and beyond the earth, the unseen worlds of spirits, good and evil, the nature and operations of Deity beyond the reach of human knowledge, as may be deemed by the Author essential to the perfect unfolding of his plan. In its style it will be likely to include all the varieties of composition that attract the attention or exhibit the capacity of man. The historic, the dialectic, the proverbial, the lyric, the narrational, the dramatic—whatever mode of expressing thought or feeling is within the scope of the human mind, that mode will find its best illustration in the Book of God; for he is the source of its

* In 1834 his first volume was published, "the result," we are told, even then, "of a long matured purpose."

capacity in man, and therefore can, as well as must, exhibit its fullness in his own word.

We might adduce, as an additional proof of this necessity, the fact that all false systems of any degree of development have embodied their claims and laws in language. God's enemy has written *his* book. The Vedas of the Brahmans are among the most ancient of these heretical compositions. The Hermes Trismegistus professes to be the utterances of Egyptian gods. "The Bana," which means "The Word," is the title of the sacred writings of the Buddhists. Teutonic idolatry had its Bible. Greece had her Oracles, the authority of whose most carefully worded responses exceeded that of any of her Pericles or Alexanders. The Sybilline books ruled the Romans, the only power whose sovereignty they acknowledged. So Mohammed, when he would organize his ambition into a sect, is compelled to write a Koran; and modern heresies, however refined and debasing, are constrained to take the form of words. Error becomes supernaturally natural in Emerson's exquisite sentences, where every word is weighed like diamond dust in the balances of expression. It becomes visionary in Swedenborg, intolerably verbose in Jackson Davis, and coarsely barbaric in Joe Smith. But, whatever name it assumes, it is ever compelled to manifest itself in a book.

A still higher proof could be drawn from that profoundest of all revelations, the nature of God himself. But as that revelation is disclosed only in his Book, it can hardly be considered an *à priori* consideration. Yet, as confirmation of those proofs which nature, man, and both true and false religions advance, it may, perhaps, rightfully appear in this connection. The expression which the invisible God employs to convey to the creature the fact of his own manifestations is the Logos, or Word. The very essence of his nature and express image of his person is THE WORD. The full significance of this statement, no creature, however exalted, can ever understand. But that it means to convey to our minds the fact that God reveals himself in an outer form, to which he assigns this most significant name, cannot be denied. Though it does not affect his eternal tripersonality, yet his manifestation of himself is thus set forth in the words his own Spirit employs, an unanswerable confirmation of the law that obtains in all lesser being. The

invisible God, invisible to his highest angels no less than to his lowest creatures, invisible by the constitution of his own being, bringeth himself, in the person of his Son, into the world, "and when he bringeth forth his only-begotten, he saith, Let all the angels of God worship him." This eternal Son is styled, The Word. This declaration has yet further and most important bearings on the subject; but for the present we limit its import to the point we are considering, and we deduce from the necessity that God himself should reveal himself in a visible form, the highest expression and the most unanswerable proof, that all his works, made in his image, must be subject to this law. As Christ is the manifestation of the infinite God, so, though in an infinitely less degree, do nature and man body forth the inner and unseen higher nature and higher man. So do the Church and the Bible show forth the divinity that dwells within them.

But these considerations are only the portal to the truth, the foundations of the temple that must be erected. It is not so much a prophecy, dumb or distinct, of the need and naturalness of an inspired volume, that creates controversy among men. It is the *fact* that such a volume *exists*, claiming such an origin, with authority correspondent, which has always, and will more and more awaken the animosity of the foes of truth, and compel divisions even among its friends. It is most natural that such a result should happen. A work so lofty in its claims, so essential to the success of the Gospel, will of course be disputed as to its authorship and authority. It will be assailed by every weapon of logic or rhetoric, of malice and ridicule. It will be undermined by flattery or by subtlety. The differences of its various copies will be multiplied and magnified. Its scientific statements will be opposed professedly in the interests of science. Its doctrines will be eviscerated, or declared unworthy of enlightened ages. Its ethics and politics, philosophy and poetry, facts and figures, will all, by feeble friends or foul foes, become the subjects of solemn or sarcastic assault.

Chief of these attacks in frequency and persistency will be that which denies its authorship. This is the seat of its strength. If it can be driven from this; if it can be made to share it with human works, if it can be shown by any array of difficulties that the doctrine is untenable, the deed is done. *The Word of*

God becomes a word of man, and its especial, supreme, sole authority among all other writings instantly and forever ends.

This subject is, therefore, most essential to our religion. They stand or fall together. This every enemy, if not every ally, sees. Let us gather around this Book, blackened with the smoke of a million battles, yet unmarred by their assaults, and strengthen ourselves with the divine power that eternally dwells within it.

We shall feel as we enter upon the examination, that no brief essay can compass its fullness. To explore its lengths and breadths and depths and heights would require ages and capacities such as belong not to time and man. It is like attempting to explore the realm of nature with our little mind, in our little moment. Nay, it is more foolish. For the Bible, if it be what it must be, according to its claims, is far fuller of divinity than nature. It has far profounder truths, far wider relations, far greater facts, far stranger mysteries. The great scholars of nature bow reverently before her multitudinous marvels. They confess that they discern but parts of her ways, and say with their inspired predecessor in this field, who rightly recognizes nature as a revelation of God, "The thunder of His power who can understand!" They declare they are but lucky children finding a few pearls on the shore of the illimitable, unfathomable sea. They modestly refuse to sit in judgment on its central realities. What know they of life? Why and how it assumes so many forms? What is the substance of the worlds? What is the age of the earth? What of the inhabitableness of the stars? What is matter? what, spirit? Some of these they attempt approximatively to answer. Of some, and by far the most and greatest, they exclaim, "We are of yesterday, and know nothing!"

And yet some of these same scholars, so humbly prostrate before nature, presume to ignore or domineer over the Word of God. Like all idolaters, they worship the creature more than the Creator; they worship the one and despise the Other. Its statements they do not regard as worthy of their attention. Their inquiries are not to be affected by its assertions. No reverence makes them uncover their feet or head as they approach its sacred pages. They treat it with the coldest neglect, with the haughtiest disdain.

Thus they demean themselves toward what? A far sublimer work and word of God than that they so faithfully revere. The Bible, if it be what it claims, is the higher complement of the book of creation. It is the spiritual as that is the material revelation of God. It is far more abundant than the latter in obstacles to its complete subjugation to the human comprehension, far more rewardable to its faithful students in knowledge and wisdom. It is higher than the heights above, deeper than the depths beneath. It dwells upon the workings of God in his spiritual universe, his creation and government of souls, not worlds; his treatment of souls fallen and unfallen; his operations to save the lost, without weakening the foundations on which the sinless can abide humble and holy. What is the subsidence or elevation of continents, the age of Niagara or Amazon, the number of genera or species of fishes, the mutual relation and interdependence of the animal races, from mollusc to man—what are such inquiries beside the themes of revelation?

But as this field is utterly inexorable, let us confine ourselves to that which is the center of the whole investigation, without which the mighty fabric, like

“The great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
And, like an unsubstantial fabric faded,
Leave not a rack behind.”

Second. In what sense, and to what degree, are the Scriptures inspired? There are many shades of belief on this subject, but they can all be reduced to three:

1. The Bible is inspired in nature, precisely like every book of man.

2. It is divinely inspired, but rather as a supervision of human minds to keep them from error, than as the express utterance of the mind of God.

3. It is directly and entirely written by God, these penmen being co-workers, but sub-workers, with him.

Two others might be included—that which denies inspiration altogether, and that which confers the extremest inspiration upon some parts, and the supervisory on the rest of the book. But the first of these denies it entirely, and can therefore be hardly said to be a doctrine of inspiration; while the second, as it grants the highest order of inspiration to a portion, and

that portion, also, the Gospels, about which the battle rages most violently, is embraced in its difficulties, and must stand or fall with it.

I. The first of these theories is the ruling dogma of the heterodoxy of to-day. It is stoutly advocated by the leaders of all outside faiths, pantheistic, rational, or "spiritual," so called. Every school of skepticism cleaves to this opinion. Emerson and Parker are one in this theory, and one in sympathy and substance with Jowett, Davidson, Williams, Colenso, and such apostate doctors of the English Church.

Inspiration, they declare, is the common gift to every mind. All have it in a larger or less degree, according to their capacity; but some may have more of it than any of the bibliographers. The Hebrew writers were some of them in the highest order of mind, some of them in inferior ranks; but all were inspired no more and no less than those of their own capacity in other lands, and lines of thought. Shakspeare and David, Plato and Isaiah, Homer and Job, are as constitutionally identical as Shakspeare and Homer and Plato are, apart from their Hebraist kinsmen. These writers are one in nature and afflatus with all other geniuses, Phidias, Raphael, Cicero, Cesar. The difference between them is that other men of might have their genius directed to lower ends—art, war, poetry, statesmanship, in a word, the humanities, while that of the Hebrews was turned toward religion and God. It is only the difference between a glass sweeping the horizon and the same glass turned to the upper heavens; a difference of elevation, not of nature. The eye is still human, still unchanged, still imperfect; but it is the only medium of communication between the outer world and the soul. No different light streams in upon that soul from the celestial than the terrestrial objects. At least, the light has no transmuting power over the organ of vision. There was no extraordinary occupation of the Bible-writing minds by the Divine Spirit; no sights nor utterance that they could not attain by the natural expansion of their own powers under the afflatus of the high and holy ideas which they were evolving.

In this sphere too they were on the same level with other seers of moral and religious truth in all climes and ages. Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates, Anaxagoras, Epictetus, Orpheus, Seneca, Swedenborg, and themselves, are all one with

Moses, Ezekiel, Paul, and John. Mr. Emerson, the greatest and most consistent writer of this school, beside whom Strauss, Rénan, Parker, and Colenso are but pigmies in genius and in daring, calls them and their works all by one name.

He clearly considers himself as belonging to the same school, and expects that his brilliant oracularisms on the highest topics of God and man will rank with Job and Solomon, Isaiah and John. He seeks diligently for bits of wisdom in Hafiz, Saadi, the Purana, and the Shastas. He sweeps their muddy streams with his clear, cold, patient eye, and gathers every diamond, however defective and however imbedded in Serbonian mud, and puts them beside the words of Jesus as though they were of like origin and authority. Nay, more; he presumes to consider himself as the superior of them all, Jesus included, on the theory that a man who masters another is indeed his master. If by hard studying one can understand Plato, then is he the superior of Plato. This theory is set forth with sharp-drawn distinctness in his essay on History, but is condensed into its opening motto:

"I am the owner of the sphere,
The seven stars, and the solar year;
Of Cæsar's hand and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart and Shakspeare's strain."

The man who could write that last line without remorse, is a fit representative of a theory which places the Bible in its authorship on the same level as all other books.

Behind the mystagogue walk all the less capacious minds that adopt this dogma as their own. Maurice, Powell, Williams, Jowett, in the English Church, Parker, Frothingham, Noyes, in American pulpits, have grasped at this theory more or less boldly as the remover of the difficulties that block their path. Maurice declares that "the inspiration of the Scriptures is generically and essentially like that of poets, and the quickening and informing spirit to which all good men ascribe their own enlightenment."* Baden Powell says, there is no "foundation in the Gospels or Epistles for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration."† The Evangelists and apostles do not "anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from

* See Aids to Faith, p. 344.

† Essays and Reviews, pp. 379, 380.

error and infirmity."* Jowett says: "Nor for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels and Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them, different from that of the preaching or teaching which they daily exercised; nor do they anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity.†"

Williams, fellow of King's College, Cambridge, "protests against that unwise exaggeration which makes the entire Bible a transcript of the Divine Omniscience;"‡ and warns his hearers not to "ascribe infallibility to men of like passions with ourselves,"§ and not "to sever, as they did not sever, their inspiration from that of the congregation at large."||

The American pupils of this master go much farther in their statements. Mr. Frothingham, one of the latest and most pronounced of this school, puts the Bible on precisely the same footing as other books, though he confesses his position is "*fundamentally* opposed to the faith of Christendom."¶ And while denouncing in almost passionate terms any especial reverence for the Book, or especial distinction above its fellows, he follows the path of his leader in his view of its inspiration. "As for inspiration, instead of being denied it is more emphatically and comprehensively affirmed, for it is held to belong to all writings of high spiritual character; nay, far more than that, it is held to be an attribute of all creative intellect in its moods of moral elevation."** Well may he conclude his dissertation by the declaration that he "reads the Bible as any other book; criticises it; judges it; but expects no superhuman wisdom from it, and will not call it the Word of God, or the book in which the words of God are especially written."††

We need quote no farther testimony as to the opinions of this class of thinkers. Nor need we present any argument against them, save one, and that Mr. Frothingham frankly confesses. It is "*fundamentally* opposed to the faith of Christendom." It sprang not from that faith. It will as certainly

* Essays and Reviews, pp. 379, 380.

† Ibid.

‡ Noyes's Essays, pp. 133, 145. See also same volume, by the same, "The Spirit and the Letter; or, the Truth and the Book."

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid.

¶ The "Radical," August, 1866, p. 449.

** Ibid., p. 454.

†† Ibid., p. 498.

stifle it, if it is inhaled by it, as azote destroys the life that inspires it. It is at instinctive and utter variance with our central thought: the union, correlation, and identification of the Christian experience and the Christian record, of the letter and the spirit, of the Word and the work of God. To this touchstone it is brought, and one trial proves its falsity. What need have we of further testimony? Put upon your specimen a drop of acid and it instantly loses its luster. It is enough. The gold is naught but pyrites. No need of smelter and crucible and other subtler tests. Cast it out. So this theory never feeds a hungry soul; never gratifies a holy taste; never cultivates a true faith, or a perfect character. It is enough. It is proved by its effect. No man can embrace it that does not instantly or gradually reject every fundamental doctrine of that Book. One can believe this of Homer and yet relish his imagination, and not distrust his statements, so far as they are historical, geographical, or illustrative of the habits of his times. He can believe it of Shakspeare and not become skeptical of his highest ideas. So one can of the moralists and philosophers of the world—Socrates, Aristotle, Xenophon, Plutarch, Quintilian. It does not destroy their veracity to consider them thoughtful students of the great problems of human nature and destiny. But let one extend this theory over the Bible, and it not only ceases to be a separate, it ceases to be an equal book. Like all in highest seats, if it falls, it plunges far below the lowest seats. It ceases to have their confidence and then their respect. Mr. Emerson daintily sets the gems of Persia and India in his pictures of silver. He never sets there a scripture verse. Though once its professed teacher, he has totally forgotten its lore. He paraphrases Psalm xxxix, and calls it "Brahma." He takes pride in conferring honor on the pagan guesses at truth, and pouring contempt on the elder and clearer Hebrew utterers of the same and greater truth. Rarely can a word eulogistic of the Bible be found in his writings. Rarely a word laudatory of Christ, except as a man of deep and tender sentiments. He represents the class. All with unequal step follow hard after him.

Most less serenely tread the Arctic Sea. They waver, they shrink. They look back like Lucifer on the divine plains they are abandoning with some twinges of remorse, with part-

ing benedictions to the happy fields. They still praise its pathos or poetry after they scorn its veracity and authority. They strive to carry with them the peace that the earlier and better doctrine imparted, but strive in vain. Their writings evince their feelings. Colenso confesses his distress. So does Strauss. They feel that the Scriptures are leaving them. It holds no communion with such flatterers. It sees through their unbelief, and covers itself from their eyes. Then they plunge into all manner of disbelief concerning it. The book ceases to be respected. It is buffeted, spit upon, scourged, sawn asunder. Its statements are denied, its professions despised, its doctrines set at naught. Does it declare a systematic order of creation through six periods of time? They treat its declaration with superciliousness. Does it describe a deluge that covered the habitable earth, and submerged all the human race but one family? They gravely charge its records with falsehood. Does it give a sober synopsis of the enslavement, emancipation, and nationalizing of the Hebrew people? They seek to pick innumerable flaws in the narrative, and to reduce the whole to a not cunningly devised fable. They go farther. Its doctrines they especially reject. Does the Bible teach the fact of a vicarious sacrifice as the basis of man's regeneration? How they scorn the doctrine, and nickname it "the sacrificial theology." Does it declare man's depravity and destruction without the grace of God in Christ? They scout it as a brain-sick fancy. Does it assert a future state of rewards and punishments, based on our earthly and voluntary relation to Christ? They deny alike our probationary condition, our dependence on Christ for salvation after death, and the existence of eternally separated states in that future world. In fact, *every* vital doctrine of the Word of God falls to the ground when the especial inspiration of the Scriptures is rejected. All that makes it actually valuable to the human soul as a revealer of its condition, the cause, the consequences, and the cure, is sneeringly or soberly rejected. They have robbed the salt of its savor, and they have nothing left wherewith to season it. They therefore readily cast it out and tread it under impudent or careless feet. True, they profess to admire some of its sayings and some of its characters. They call Isaiah "the most inspired of men." They admire the grandeur of the Revela-

tor, but it is as they would a comely face. They reject the thoughts of these admirable writers, and pre-eminently despise their gifts and their gospel. Some of them are especially profuse in adulations of Him they have betrayed; they are prostrate in admiration before an idol their own hands have undeified and mutilated. For all this profession and prostration is accompanied with a denial of his most avowed and most solemn claims, and with unbelief in his most frequent and most important utterances. Their Bible is not only "Hamlet," with Hamlet left out. It is Hamlet with Hamlet denied ever to have existed.

While the weaker infidel still clings to a godless Bible and an undeified Christ, their leaders carry their reasoning to its legitimate conclusions. They treat the Bible as The London Quarterly says Strauss should have treated it, after his fancied destruction of its authenticity. It is to them "a closed book for evermore." They have turned from "the reproachful record of their greatest delusion." Thus we have seen Emerson, and Thoreau, and the American skeptic boldly discard the shrine from which they have expelled the God. Thus will all follow them who dare to follow the like views of inspiration to their natural necessary result.

This fate, as we have seen, does not overtake any other work thus relegated to a human origin. We do not disbelieve the geography of the Odyssey because we fail to believe with the early Greeks in its inspiration. We do not deny the leading doctrines of Plato because we refuse to call him divine. How happens it that this distinction awaits the Bible alone? Because we take away its foundation. Its infallible and exclusive inspiration is the only basis on which its authority or influence can stand. It can share its honors with no other book, even as its author, the divine Logos, can share his with no other god. The Pantheon must be his all in all, or not at all. So the Bible stands in the library. It alone must be worshiped. It only is divine. It falls and Christ falls with it, if it dare to share its throne with that of man, however pure and perfect be his genius and his strain.

To this objection against this theory no others need be added. It is not necessary thrice to slay the slain. If it extracts from the Bible its whole power, denies its statements and doctrines, and makes it a careless work for friendly or unfriendly study

or neglect, the question in debate is concluded. Whoever goes thus far, if consistent, will go farther. He will and ought to cease to study or use it as a text-book, or even to respect such a farrago of nonsense and lies. Better far preach from Homer or Shakspeare, for they make far less pretensions, and far less claims upon our credulity.

The ground out of which this theory springs is plausible, though shallow. It ignores sin and guilt, a fall and redemption, and puts every soul *ab origine* and inseparably *en rapport* with its Maker. It catches at those better influences which arise in every mind, through the gift of Christ, who is the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, and asserts that these gleams of conscience, these flashes of the eye of God, are the natural, universal, and eternal property of every soul. It steadily refuses to recognize the natural proclivity of the soul to evil, the undertow that controls the current of our being, and therefore refuses to discover any need of an atonement and an Atoner. They need no guide through life, no light from heaven above the brightness of this natural, inward sun, no staff in death, no Daysman at the judgment, no Preserver through eternity. Pure naturalism is the sole and all-sufficient law. Such a thing is in most violent antagonism with Christian faith. Both cannot live in the same soul, cannot endure eternally in the same universe. If entertained, the only result will be the evisceration of Christianity from its believer. Spiritualist, pantheist, fatalist, rationalist, radical, liberal, he may call himself, but not Christian. It can never be adopted by the Church, unless it first ceases to be the Church of Christ.

The other two theories are both esteemed orthodox, and are advocated by separate schools of evangelical thinkers. Between them, however, there is much to choose. And we shall seek to show that the oldest wine is in this case the best; that it, with all its difficulties, the better satisfies the conditions of the problem, and that the objections which lie against it, lie with equal force against its weaker brother; while the latter points and tempts to the outer sea of infidelity, which we have just been exploring.

The two views may be expressed in two words: the Supervisional, and the Verbal. The former considers the Bible writers to have been superintended, so as to be preserved from error,

while allowed a less or larger degree of freedom in the selection of facts and in their expression. The latter believes every word to have been spoken under the inbreathing or impulse of the Holy Ghost. The advocates of the former theory sometimes wrongfully call it the dynamical,* as if in contrast with the true view, which they mistakenly term the mechanical. They also assume for it the title of plenary,† a designation that has long been adopted by verbal inspirationists as their own.

II. 1. Our first objection to this theory is that it originated in opposition to the higher view of infallible verbal inspiration, and not to that of a latitudinarian character. Its chief advocates have much more warmly assailed the former than they have the latter.

That it took its rise from an unwillingness to embrace the higher doctrine, is evident from the concessions of its chief supporters. Coleridge was the fountainhead whence it sprang.

* Lee, [Inspiration of the Scriptures, page 33,] after describing quite correctly the verbal theory, erring, however, in saying "it practically ignores the human element," which it no more does than the true doctrine of Christ practically ignores the human element in his Person, adds, this "has of late years been termed the mechanical theory of inspiration." As he describes the dynamical theory, it will be found to not essentially differ from this: "The dynamic theory of inspiration implies such a divine influence as employs man's faculties according to their natural laws. Man is not considered *in any sense* the cause or originator of the revelation, of which God alone is the source, but human agency is regarded as the condition under which the revelation becomes known to others."—Page 39. He elsewhere rejects the theory "that the subject-matter alone proceeded from the Holy Spirit, while its language was left to the unaided choice of its writers" as "a fantastic notion."—Page 45; see also pages 87, 187, and 190. Yet he does not always adhere to this position; as when he speaks of the prophet "embodying in suitable language the ideas supernaturally infused into his soul."—Page 196. The truth is, verbal inspiration is much more dynamical than the supervisory, for it demands the activity of the whole mind of God and the man in its composition; not an overseership merely.

† Less careful is Alford. After properly defining verbal inspiration, [it is as Lee says, "a consistent intelligible theory,"] he adds: "Plenary inspiration consists in the fullness of the influence of the Holy Spirit especially raising and enabling for the work. The men were full of the Holy Ghost. The books are the pouring out of that fullness through the men, the conservation of that treasure in earthen vessels, in a manner which distinguishes them from all other writers in the world, and their work from all other work. The treasure is ours," [here is the fatal concession,] "*as it only can be, in the imperfections of human speech, in the limitations of human thought, in the variety incident at first to individual character, and then to manifold transcription and the lapse of ages.*"—Prologomena of Greek Test., page 21. He thus gives the Bible original as well as subsequent imperfection. Such inspiration is as far from plenary as it is from verbal.

Though it has had advocates in previous ages, and not a few saintly names in its roll, yet it dates its present origin and power to this astute but erratic thinker. Thus, Mr. Browne, in his *Essay on Inspiration*,* says, "One of the first among ourselves to put forth a bold theory of inspiration was Coleridge. He brings many reasons against a rigid mechanical theory," [such he entitles the verbal theory,] "against a belief that the *Bible is simply the voice of God's Holy Spirit*, uttered through different organs and instruments; but he does not fix any limit; he does not say how far he admits divine teaching or inspiration to extend, nor does he apparently draw any line of distinction between the inspiration of holy men of old and the spiritual and providential direction of enlightened men of every age and nation." Thus it will be seen that he was the father, in modern religious literature, of both theories of inspiration, the non-verbal and non-especial. The latter has been carried to its legitimate results by Emerson and his school. The former is still held as the true doctrine by scholars of undoubted orthodoxy.†

Lee evidently seeks to occupy a middle ground between the supervisionist and the verbalist. His own theory needs but little modification to make it utter the exact truth. He declares that it is his object "to establish all that the supporters of verbal inspiration desire to maintain: namely, the infallible certainty, the indisputable authority, the perfect and entire truthfulness of all and every the parts of Holy Scripture." Yet he earnestly denies "that each word and phrase to be found in the Bible had been infused by the Holy Ghost into

* Aids to Faith, pp. 342-344.

† It may be said that Semler is the founder of this school rather than Coleridge, as their views are not dissimilar. Coleridge says, "Whatever *finds* me brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit." And then denies that all of the Bible thus "*finds*" him, and that what does not is inspired. Semler says, "Whatever I find in Scripture profitable for doctrine and for reproof *to me*, that is theopneustic, or must be referred by me to God the author;" but he adds that he will not dispute with any one who maintains the inspiration of other books of Scripture which he finds of no use to himself. (Reply to Essays and Reviews, p. 418.)

But that the German was not the founder of this school is seen from the fact that it has had no special advocates in Germany, except Tholuck, who refers to Coleridge as one of his chief authorities and not to Semler. He says, "We cannot forbear inserting here the words of a profound writer who has become an intellectual polar star to many inquiring minds in England and America, I mean Samuel Taylor Coleridge." (Noyes's Theol. Essays, p. 97.)

the minds of the sacred writers." He repeatedly opposes all such views, and with far more vigor than he exhibits in confronting the statements of Coleridge or Morell.*

Other writers are less careful in their treatment of this theory and its supporters. Dr. Nast, one of the first of Christian scholars, speaks thus positively: "The theory of what is called verbal inspiration, far from being essential to the divine authority of the Gospel records, is, indeed, as we shall further show, the only ground on which an objection can be brought against their claim of being authentic and authoritative records of a divine revelation; and though this theory of verbal inspiration has been received as if it were tantamount to plenary inspiration, it rests on no Scripture authority, and is supported by no historical testimony, if we except a few ambiguous metaphors of the Fathers."† He thus presents his theory as being chiefly valuable because it is opposed to the more extreme view of equally ardent and able Christian scholars. Dean Alford, whom also he quotes, in his prologomena makes an equally vigorous assault on verbal inspiration. "Much might be said," he says, "of the *à priori* unworthiness of such a theory. . . . I do not hesitate to say, that being thus applied," [to the Gospels,] "its effects will be to destroy the credibility of our Evangelists."‡ He then proceeds to quote an example which we

* What Mr. Morell's views are may be seen in this extract: "Imperfections both in moral and religious ideas are mixed up with all their" [the Hebrew] "sacred writings. Christianity consists not in propositions. Why should we be perpetually craving after a stiff, literal, verbal infallibility?" To the middle of these phrases Dr. Lee objects; not to the first or last. His objection goes much further than his theory, if consistently elucidated, would allow. It is a happy illustration of the true theory. "Few indeed," he says, "will be found to deny that Christianity consists in propositions; as few, perhaps, as would allege that an electric current consists in the formulæ by which Gauss or Faraday have expressed its laws. The *knowledge*, however, of what Christianity is, as well as the laws of electricity, *must* be communicated by propositions; and it is not more unnatural that the Christian should 'crave' for an assurance that God's revelation has come to him unclouded by human error, than that the student in the exact sciences should 'crave' for *perfect accuracy* in the structure of the formulæ by which the philosopher from whom he derives his information has expressed the secrets of nature."—Pages 143, 144, Note. What is perfect accuracy in a formula but verbal infallibility in revelation? It should be noticed how carefully he refrains from opposing the chief assault on verbal infallibility. For further proof of the looseness of Mr. Morell's views, consult Aids to Faith, pages 345, 346. They are congenial with Maurice, Semler, Coleridge, and Frothingham.

† Nast's Comm., Prolegom., p. 137.

‡ Prologom. Greek Test., p. 20.

shall consider hereafter. Enough for our present purpose if we see that he is more anxious to demolish the stronghold than to drive back the enemy.

Tholuck writes his essay on this side of the question solely in answer to Professor Gaussen, whose positions he criticizes from the beginning to the end of his article. His essay is properly placed by Mr. Noyes among those opposed to the essential doctrines of the Church and the Word of God.

2. This theory has never awakened the opposition of the enemies of the faith. Bitter are their denunciations of verbal inspiration. In it they see the force that ever confronts their own. The lower regions of supervisional inspiration never awaken their fear or hate. Their clear eye sees that its positions can never stand if the central doctrine fall, that it is so inconsistent with the nature of mind, and so ready to concede the *predominance* of the human element, with all its infirmities, in portions, if not all, of the Word of God, that it can never compel a skeptical philosopher to acknowledge its soundness nor prevent his overthrow of the central truth. For he may well say, "If you declare that errors have been allowed by the sacred penman, you have conceded the main point of defense. The attempt to protect your position by asserting that the Spirit kept them from essential error, will not avail for defense. Who is to be the judge of essential error? Who is to decide where the existing error stands? One may locate it in one spot, another in another; one may extend it largely, the other limit it carefully. What is the final court of appeal?" The skeptic accepts the concession, and presses haughtily forward to the destruction of its entire divinity, despising the porters who have thus unwisely surrendered him the keys. The result which Alford declares to follow the theory of verbal inspiration follows this theory: "Its effect is to destroy the credibility" of the Bible. Its advocates, if hard pressed by our adversaries, which, fortunately for them, they are not, (why should they be?) would have to do as they say the advocates of the ipsissimal theory do: "while broadly asserted, it is in detail abandoned." They cannot agree on "some one manuscript which carries the weight of 'supervisional' inspiration, or some text whose authority shall be undoubted." No two of this school can come as near together as all of the more

orthodox school, much less can they win the outer heretics to their view. With whatever carefulness they seek to guard their treasure, and we concede their conscientious zeal in this matter, when they are asked which is the true sermon on the mount, which the true inscription on the cross, which the true story of the resurrection, they lose all power of discernment, and can only say, "Substantial truth is found in all, and error," which they call unsubstantial, "exists there also." With such arguments how can they contend with the enemies at the gate? They are properly despised and neglected, or else absorbed by the gainsayers.*

3. This theory cuts the nerves of minute study for the harmonizing of the Word. It is as fatal to sound scholarship as to sound doctrine. That scholars and theologians advocate it is no proof of its real effects. They bring with them to their investigation, not this theory, but the old, the divine feeling of its

* It is a noticeable, we may say a remarkable, fact that both of these schools agree almost exactly in their language concerning the condition of the Gospel writers. Thus Alford says: "This treasure is ours, as it only can be ours, in the imperfection of human speech." Elliot, in "Aids to Faith," says: "We may admit therein the existence of such incompleteness, such limitations, and such imperfections as belong even to the highest forms of purely truthful human testimony." Nast says: "Plenary" (by which he means full oversight, not full dictation) "inspiration . . . is not inconsistent even with *inaccuracies*" [the italics are his own] "in matters which all agree in regarding as wholly unimportant." Who the "all" are we are not told. The "Methodist Quarterly Review," vol. x, p. 269, says: "As their infallibility" [the sacred writers'] "is not essential to the authority of the Bible as a system of religious instruction, may we not presume that in these things human infirmity was permitted to err?" This essay also claims that "Jesus was doubtless capable of mistakes," a logical analogy, but which most would shrink from saying. How much do these differ from Jowett and others in their declaration that the writers do not "anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from *error or infirmity*?" (See page 20.) That is, in their writings. In themselves, as men, all grant it. How nearly identical is it with Frothingham's statement of his professor's course with it? "Discrepancies in the history he regretfully allowed. Weaknesses in argument, impertinences in illustration, *non sequiturs* in deduction, slips in allusion, etc., he discerned, noted, and felt no call to apologize for and annul." True, the orthodox doctors protest against any annulling of its authority, because of these "imperfections," but they protest in vain. They are caught in their unwise concession. The ground gives way beneath their feet. They have nothing wherewith to answer. In the words, far more more than in the works, of God

"One step broken, the great scale's destroyed.

Whatever link you strike,

Tenth or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

entire and perfect sacredness, its entire and perfect divinity. They worship at its shrine, they seek to know its full meaning, its intended and real, if hidden harmony. They are orthodox in spite of their outer creed, by the inward culture of the soul in the elder and superior truth. The founders of error are usually nearer the truth than their disciples. "It takes time to develop logical principles." Semler was much more orthodox than his pupils. Channing is far nearer the truth than his two chief children, Parker and Emerson. Ballou had orthodox views of the nature of the atonement, and only separated from the truth as to its extent. His Church to-day deny both. Locke was the father of Hume and Paine. So these Christian scholars who have imbibed this error will find that those who follow them will inevitably separate themselves farther from the truth. They will use their concessions as the lever to force the Bible from its divine foundation. They will dwell upon acknowledged "inaccuracies" as furnishing "illustrations of the conditions and characteristics of human testimony," and will say, *must* say, this theory does not differ radically from that of the Westminster Review, concisely stated by Mr. Frothingham: "What is true in the Bible is to be accepted, because true; and what is untrue, as untrue is to be discarded: *the errors are to be corrected*, and the constituent elements are themselves to be subjected to analysis."*

This result their disciples will assuredly reach. They will advance in the path that is thus sought to be cast up between the scriptural theory and the skeptical, not toward the former, but the latter. The error is not two generations old. It has hardly won its position. If it attains any influence it will inevitably breed yet greater heresy. Sin bringeth forth death. It will destroy accurate and minute scholarship, and make the Bible a subject of only general consideration, and then of no consideration whatever.

4. This theory has no foundation in the nature of the human mind. It is impossible to conceive of a supervisional direction in any human production that shall preserve it from substantial error, and shall yet give full scope to the original faculties of the individual penman. If Napoleon wishes to issue an edict, he does not say to his clerk, "This is the substance of what I

* The Radical, vol. i, p. 454.

wish to say; put it in your language." He is as particular about the expression as about the idea. They are inseparable. The inventor does not say to his apprentice, "Here is my thought, put it in a model of your own;" nor does the sculptor thus speak to his pupil. Idea and form, though not identical, are inseparable. God cannot supervise his book in any partial or plenary manner, and then allow the men who wrote it to say their thoughts in their way, or his thoughts in their way. It is contrary to the laws of mind. If he wrote it, he wrote it; if they wrote it, they wrote it; if, as is true, both wrote it, both *wrote* it. There may be a mysterious, miraculous union of the two natures; for that we have the highest analogy. There can be no supervisory arrangement which does not substantially, and, to the ultimate confession of every thoughtful mind, perfectly remove God from any actual authorship. This argument, which will be considered more fully in its positive instead of this negative form, brings us to the point whence we started.

5. Our whole argument for inspiration is based primarily on the necessity laid upon God to appear in this form among men. If he only superintends human writers, he does not actually reveal himself. He is only present in the book as he was in Abraham, Moses, and David, not as he was in the prophecies of Isaiah, or the person of Christ. All considerations that demand a book of God demand that it be his directly, not indirectly; his personally, not episcopally. The lowest theory of inspiration; in one respect, is in advance of this dogma, for that grants the Bible direct origin from God, though it denies to it any superior, or, at least, supreme degree of this afflatus. It has a groundwork in the reason of man, and can therefore be rationally stated, defended, or opposed. This is without any basis in reason or faith, and is alike rejected of both.

6. The object for which this theory is assumed is not thereby attained. It is adopted to avoid difficulties that attend the higher doctrine. "Statements of the same event cannot be reconciled," it is said. There is no remedy for these differences, in verbal inspiration. Our only refuge is to admit differences, but deny fallibility. It is an ostrich way of escape from the pursuers. It avails naught. Who cares for our pretense of infallibility after we have granted irreconcilability? The rationalist would smile scornfully at such a defense. We

have given him all he asks; he will allow us to still *call* ourselves unconquered.

If the writers are supervisionally preserved from error, then must their records be equally correct. There is but one sermon on the mount. The two reports must be reconciled. There is but one true narrative of the birth or death of Christ. The four reporters must be made to agree. All error here is "substantial." If the Holy Ghost supervised, he should have made Luke and Matthew agree verbally, if it is necessary that such an agreement should obtain in verbal inspiration.

For these reasons, therefore, we are constrained to reject this theory of inspiration. It is a modern theory, having no formal existence till within a century. It is stated honestly, and by devout men, to guard the sacred Scriptures from assault, but actually turns all its guns against the defenders, not the opposers of the word. It has no strength against the foes, and is only embarrassing to the friends of the gospel. It weakens the passion and the power of exact scholarship in what Bengel calls "the native force of the words" (*nativa verborum vis*) of Scripture. It breeds legitimately and irresistibly the very indifference and infidelity that it professes to detest, and that many of its advocates do most heartily detest. It has no foundation in the declarations of the Bible itself, nor in the constitution of the human mind. It actually removes God from the authorship of his word, and gives the Bible less of a real theopneustic, or God-breathing character, than the most violent forms of infidelity allow.

Many problems are unsolved and insoluble on any theory. None are solved by the supervisory that cannot be as easily explained on the higher ground; while no concessions, in the latter case, surrender the whole truth to the doubter, as we see is frequently and legitimately done by those who occupy a lower and less fortified position. We shall show hereafter that this theory answers no end that the other does not better answer. It removes no difficulties, and hence ought never to have been originated.

We have dwelt upon this theory at some length, to the real interruption of our argument, because it is peculiarly an English, and so an American theory. While Semler may have suggested the thought to Coleridge, which is the basal idea of

his "Confessions," the German is not the originator of the theory which some evangelical divines have made their own.* German heresy has taken the form of Emerson, German orthodoxy has not taken that of Tholuck.† Or if it has followed him, its opinions have not given his theory its present prevalence. It is the rather an English *vis media*, an attempt on the part of that ever middle-traveling mind to avoid the extremes of faith and unfaith. Hence its chief advocates are of that nation. Isaac Taylor partly concedes it.‡ Browne, Arnold, Lee, Stanley, Westcott, Alford are among its partial or earnest advocates; while American scholars have followed in their path, and divines of all sects have advocated the dogma, and look askance on Gaussen and the truth. We have quoted only one of the American authors, partly because he is perhaps the clearest in his statement of this view, and partly because his works are accessible to all our readers. That he does not stand alone may be seen in this Quarterly, in an article to which we have referred, written by one of our first thinkers and representatives.

We turn from these views of utter and of partial error to the truth, simple, indestructable. We shall endeavor to show that the reasons which require any Bible, require that it should be verbally inspired; that the nature of language and thought make the same demand; that the instincts of man's nature can be satisfied with no less; that the character of its composition proves it; that the Church in all ages has adopted this as its only doctrine; that the Scriptures themselves affirm it; that no more difficulties attend it than accompany the lower theory, for it overcomes all the obstacles which that attempts to remove, and is strong to resist attacks upon the Word of God with a strength which its rival never possesses; and that wisest advocates of a special inspiration are constrained to take refuge in this doctrine when they would set forth the truth in its simplest and most enduring form.

* "A freer treatment of this question, namely, the limitation of inspiration to the subject-matter, has from the first, along with individual advocates of a more rigid view, found place in the English Church."—Tholuck: Noyes's, *Essays*, p. 86. See also Lee on Warburton, pp. 142, 143. Doddridge yielded partially to its influence.

† Hurst on Rationalism, pp. 200, 202. ‡ Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, pp. 342, 344.

ART. II.—THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE.

It is nearly a hundred years since, under the splendid though often guilty administration of Warren Hastings, India came to be an active partner in the affairs of the modern world. It was supposed to have amassed within itself an inexhaustible material wealth, and thither, as to a newly opened storehouse which ages had been filling, were turned the steps of adventurers in commerce and politics. With these went also, in various capacities, scholars and men of letters. One of these, Mr. Halhed, employing his leisure in curious observation, was astonished to find, in his own words, "a language of the most venerable and unfathomable antiquity now shut up in the libraries of the Brahmans, and appropriated solely to the records of religion, closely resembling the Latin and Greek in its groundwork, its monosyllables, its numerals, and such appellations as would be discriminated on the immediate dawn of civilization." Following Halhed, as the pioneer who first undertook the grammatical study of the language, was Sir William Jones, a poet of high excellence, and widely conversant in Asiatic literature. Many an Englishman in those years returned to display his wealth gained in India; but Sir William Jones and his co-laborers surprised and enriched the learned world by bringing out an entire language and literature.

Separate as India had ever been from the life of the Western world, only vague rumors, dating chiefly from the visit of Alexander, and containing little real information, had reached the classic nations. These rumors, though exaggerated into the marvelous, produced no lasting impression, and India had for centuries been, in European eyes, merely as many other lands, available and remunerative to the enterprises of commerce, with a fabulous repute for inexhaustible stores of ancient treasure. Now, however, the announcement that a language had been found, having marked affinity with the classic tongues, and a development in some respects higher than any other, a language apparently traceable to the earliest utterances of the infant world, aroused in many minds a passion for investigation. A graceful translation of the tender and beautiful poem of the *Sakuntala* by Sir William Jones, much

admired and commended by Goethe, then ruler in the poetic world, awakened lively hopes that riches of poetry, philosophy, and eloquence were now to be added to the known literary treasures of the race. Men of genius and learning, from England, France, and Germany, devoted themselves to the study of the new language, as astronomers to the observation of a new planet. Manuscripts were brought to Europe in large numbers, and three generations of students have employed their energies in this direction. About seven hundred works have been written in exposition and illustration, and at this time the Sanscrit literature is better known in Europe than it has been known in India for the last two thousand years. What was inert and useless on its native soil, has, since its transportation, become a vital and important element in philological science.

We propose to give some outline of the Sanscrit and its literature, and then to venture an inquiry of the practicability and advantage of its introduction as a study into our higher institutions of learning.

The science of comparative philology has developed the history of our race in many directions far beyond any written records. Like the kindred science of geology, it is unable to supply exact dates, yet is perfectly trustworthy in its general deductions. A people is traced by its language to its original dwelling-place. By its linguistic affinities and developments, its relation to other peoples, and its relative time of migration from the common home, are ascertained. In this way the races of Europe—Celtic, Hellenic, Slavic, Teutonic—are shown to have had their common origin among the highlands of Central Asia. Thence, by successive waves of emigration, they removed westward before the dates of their written histories. Near the Asiatic home, probably the last to leave it, remained two of the kindred tribes, the Persians and the Aryans. The latter made their way down the rivers to the southward, and driving out the aborigines, possibly eastward, occupied the great peninsula. The Persians gained the higher lands to the west, and in time gave their kindred a name suggested by the effects of "more indulgent skies," Handu, or Swarthy, and called their country "Handu-stan," "Swart-land." By this name they are known to most other nations, but they call

themselves "Arya." Having remained at home while others departed, and having then removed but a short and easy distance, they may be presumed to have carried with them a large portion of the primitive speech; and, as they had few transitions and revulsions in their subsequent history, so their language met afterward with few important modifications. This language, called afterward the Sanscrita, or the Perfect, and believed by themselves to be of divine origin, is not, indeed, the parent, but the eldest sister of the Persian and European tongues, and bears many marks of being but one remove from that developed by the party, sometimes called the Japhetic, that went northeastward from the dispersion at Babel.

The character of the Sanscrit, in view of its affinity with other languages, is peculiarly interesting. In euphony it has probably no equal. The transition from word to word, and even from syllable to syllable, is made perfectly soft and musical; and thus made agreeable to the ear, it is represented to the eye with perfect accuracy by nearly sixty characters, which unite in writing with a beauty like that with which they blend and harmonize in sound. This euphonic precision causes to the learner greater initial difficulty, but it at length becomes an unfailing source of pleasure. The long combinations, which look so unwieldy, become as brief musical *recitativos*, compared with which the brief, dislocated utterances of our western tongues seem abrupt and chopping. The accentuation also is peculiar. But when the eye and ear have become familiarized to the novel work, a sense of the beautiful continually arises, both from the euphony and the orthography. The Deva-nagari alphabet is inferior in calligraphy to the Arabic only. Equally distinguished is the Sanscrit for its facility of derivation and composition. All the apparent synonyms, "identities with shades of difference," which our English draws from other languages, this is able to form within itself. Only the Greek can in this respect be compared with it. A "dhatu," or root, gives forth a long series of derivatives by means of affixes more palpably significant than those of the Greek, while, as many (especially Donaldson in the *New Cratylus*) have shown, the affixes of the Greek require comparison with those of the Sanscrit, to which they are closely allied, for their illustration and com-

prehension. These roots are often, and in words of most frequent usage, simply identical with those of European languages. We find our English "father," "mother," "son," "daughter," "cow," "path," and very many others, the same in Sanscrit. Perhaps the pastoral life of our common ancestors is shown by the fact that "daughter" in this early, almost primitive tongue, means "milk-maid."

In etymology the Sanscrit so far surpasses all others, that their systems seem to be only mutilations of its own. Its three genders, three numbers, and eight cases cause the declined word to represent in itself a large variety of relations. The development of verbal forms is perhaps not equal to that of the Greek; but here again the peculiar effect and meaning of the Greek terminations can be realized only by comparison with those of the Sanscrit. This language makes etymology in some sense a substitute for syntax. Its facility in forming compounds, by which the adjuncts are easily moulded into one euphonious word with their subject, (which also adds greatly to the poetic power of the language,) makes formal syntactical arrangements less necessary. Thus, "chatuspari" means "a man who is beaten by four others;" "unmattaganga" means "a place where the Ganges is furious." Sometimes these compounds are interesting, not merely as syntactical contrivances, but associations of ideas. Thus "naka," "heaven," is made of "na" and "ka," (*κακος*;) meaning "no sin." "Naktam," "night," "na" and "ktam," "no walking." Thus many of our familiar words are found to embody definite compounds, which may be resolved into simpler ideas.

The literature of the Sanscrit is remarkable for its copiousness and its antiquity. Of about twelve thousand works now known to exist, few are less than two thousand years old, and many are very much older. The remote source from which all this literature takes its rise is the Veda. "Veda" means knowledge. But to understand this term we must again refer to the origin of the Aryan race. From the Central Asian home nearly all the kindred tribes pushed, as with an instinctive impulse, to the northwest. Passing the gates of the Caucasus into Europe, they became energetic and practical nations. For twenty-five centuries they have been the foremost actors in the history of the world. They have perfected



art, have subdued nature, and have spread their influence and policy over most of the globe. To Europe we must look for the dramatic and historic glory of the Aryan men. The Hindoo, after all his brethren had departed westward, made his way slowly, as if against some natural law, to the south and east, crossing the Himalayas, and finding his home along the valleys of the Indian rivers. In this rich, self-satisfying land, shut by natural barriers, he was secluded from the rest of the world. Strabo remarks that no great conqueror from the west but the fabled Bacchus, and Hercules, and, later, Alexander, ever assailed India, nor did an Indian army ever invade another land. The result of this quiet seclusion, which, though interrupted, was not destroyed by certain internal struggles, (the chief of which, celebrated in the *Maha-bharata*, that is, *Magnum Indicum s. c. Bellum*, resulted in the overthrow of the warrior race,) was that the Hindoo mind, uninterested in enterprises of war and commerce, in art and politics, turned to contemplation within itself. Here it toiled with a quiet industry like the coral in the Indian seas. Its highest effort was the grasping of the idea of an eternal self. Its highest religious flight was to realize the bond which connected the personal self (*atman*) with this Eternal Self, (*Paramatman*.) This bond is obscured by material creation and this world's affairs, as the sun is obscured by mists and vapors, which, however, are unsubstantial and delusive. Our present life is a "*pretyahava*," a birth after a previous death, a death by separation from the self-existent, to which that we call death is a restoration. Therefore the wisest temper in this life was a yearning after death. The Hindoo, directly the opposite of his Greek kinsman, turned away from the useful and the beautiful, from outward activities and interests, and contemplated an eternity of thought and rest. He was the most perfect man, who was most abstracted from practical affairs, and in retirement gave himself to calm meditation. A Brahman once traveled westward as far as Athens. He found men with whom nature and the affairs of the present life were everything. Perplexed, perhaps disgusted, at the gay and busy dash of the atheistic world around him, he resolved to give a lesson of a better way. He burned himself on his own funeral pile at Athens, and the Greeks, astonished rather than instructed, inscribed

upon the tomb of the lone traveler, that he had sought immortality after the old custom of the Indians. Such were the Hindoos as found by Alexander: a nation of philosophers, whose inward life had absorbed all their practical faculties, and who, devoted to religious and metaphysical ideas, were neither able nor desirous to obtain a place in history.

The germ of this temper of mind is found in the Veda—that body of sacred poetry embodying doctrines, hymns, and rules of sacrifice, whose origin is previous to all history. The legend of the Veda is this: Brahman, the self-existing element, burns with a desire to create, and, from the heat, sweat exudes at the pores of his or its body. He sees in this water his own shadow, falls in love with it, and produces Atharvan, lord of creation. This one produces twenty classes of poets, whose poems are the Atharvana Veda. Brahman then creates three gods: Agni, (fire,) for the earth; Vayu, (wind,) for the sky; and Aditya, (sun,) for the heavens. From Agni then comes the Rig-Veda; from Vayu the Yagur-Veda; and from Aditya the Sama-Veda. The Vedas came from the Rishis, to whom they were first delivered, to ten Mandalas, or select families, for preservation and transmission. The first Veda is for the general use of all Brahmans—the descendants of the Rishis; the others are for the use of the three orders of priests.

Some of these Vedic hymns are really beautiful, and seem to present the thoughts of a simple, pious people. One, addressed to Varuna, (*ὀυρανός*), “Lord of all, of heaven and earth,” is a litany whose strains of penitent thought and faith we cannot despise.

“However we break thy laws from day to day, men as we are, O god Varuna, do not deliver us unto death, nor to the blow of the furious, nor to the anger of the spiteful.” “If I go along trembling, like a cloud driven by the wind, have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. Through want of strength, thou strong and bright god, I have gone to the wrong shore: have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. Whenever, O Varuna, we men commit an offense before the heavenly host; whenever we break thy law through thoughtlessness, have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.”

These expressions, taken from a large number of similar ones, show the presence of moral truths in the Vedic hymns. Here we see a belief in God, a perception of the difference between good and evil, a conviction of divine hatred toward

sin, and that there is some element of guilt even in our infirmities; also, that while moral laws are eternal, "He is merciful even to him who hath committed sin." There is a manifest propensity to worship fire. The glow of the rising sun, and the bursting of flame out of darkness, were always impressive upon the Aryan mind. Agni, god of fire, is called messenger from earth to heaven. "Thy appearance is fair to behold, thou bright-faced Agni, when like gold thou shinest at hand; thy brightness comes like the lightning of heaven; thou showest splendor like the bright sun."

Although many gods are named in the Veda, yet each is always addressed as possessing the attributes of all; as if he were, in fact, the only Divine Being. "They call him Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni." "That which is One, the wise call in many ways." It would seem that while the attributes of God had become reckoned as gods, the idea of One in whom all inhered had not yet died away. In process of time the phenomena of nature assume, as in Greece, the character of divine beings. Thus "Ushas," the Dawn, daughter of "Dyaus," the Sky, corresponds to the classic Aurora. A hymn is found, in which some man, who in the far ages watched the ever glorious rising of the morn, speaks out the awe and gladness of his heart in language like that used by many a poet since: "She brought light by striking down darkness." "She rose up, spreading far and wide, and moving toward every one. She grew in brightness, wearing her brilliant garment. The mother of the morning clouds, (lit. *cows*,) the leader of the days, she shone forth, gold-colored, lovely to behold." These simple thoughts, uttered in great variety of rhythm, with every word expressive, are very charming.

The Vedic cosmogony is impressive. A hymn, of which there are two metrical versions in English, is wonderfully bold and sublime. It refers to an epoch previous to all existence. "Nothing that is, was then." "Even what is not, did not then exist." Being had neither positive nor negative side. "What was it that covered what?" A Grecism! What was the covering, and what the covered? "Was water the chaos that swallowed all? There was no death, therefore there was nothing deathless." Can a negative exist without a positive? "There was no space, no life, no time, no solar torch by

which morning might have been told from evening." "That One (the Self-existent) breathed breathless by itself. It enjoyed more than mere existence, yet its life was not dependent on anything else, as our life is dependent on the air we breathe. It breathed breathless." "Darkness there was as of ocean without light." Here "by the shore of the Absolute, which has no shore," breathing and heaving within itself, without a star, creation begins. "Then first came love upon it, the bond between things created and uncreated. A ray of light enters. Who, indeed, knows? The gods were later than its forming, therefore who knows whence it came? The All-beholder in the heavens? or not even He?" This is a poem most striking in conception, in logic, and in language.

These specimens illustrate the best style of thought in the Vedas. Our authorities agree that they must have been composed earlier than B. C. 1200. The Brahmans claim that they have no human author, and they feel the deepest pain at the inquiries of European scholars into their dates and authorship. They call them "Sriti," "Revealed," and all other writings "Smriti," "Recollected." The Vedic hymns existed many centuries before any trace of the art of writing appears among the Hindoos. They were, like the Homeric poems, kept in memory by constant recitation, and thus comes to our view an important element in Hindoo society. The Brahmans appear from the first as an intellectual and highly cultivated class among the Aryans. They were the reputed descendants of those Rishis to whom the Veda was given, and they hold their position by a conceded divine appointment until this day. During the Vedic period, under the title of "puropitas," they had a controlling influence over matters not merely of religion and philosophy, but of war and government. When the Vedic stream ceased to flow, they set themselves carefully to gather into Sanhitas, or collections, the wealth of the productive ages. These Sanhitas are the classified Vedas, as distinct from the *Veda* in its broadest sense. After this was a period of general comment and exposition. These comments and explanatory essays, being for the use of the Brahmans, are called Brahmanas.

We now arrive at an interesting period in the history of an intellectual people. It is the period of the art preservative of arts, when, production having ceased, literature became an

objective art, like the period of Masora in Hebrew literature, or the Alexandrine in Greek. Rules are formed, grammar and rhetoric appear, and the labor of Aristarchus and Longinus begins. This, in Sanscrit literature, is called the period of Sutras or rules. The writings regarded unquestionably divine now cease, and the Sutras are of confessedly human origin, yet they rest upon the Veda as a basis. A native writer says that what is recollected implies something previously known, and *that* came by revelation. From this relation of the two departments of Sanscrit literature, the revealed and the recollected, arises the Brahminical idea of heresy. The authority of the Veda must be admitted. On this point orthodoxy allows no evasion or hesitation; but this is a matter of acknowledgment of authority, not at all of agreement in interpretation.

There are six schools or systems, differing on points of vital importance, yet all reputed orthodox because admitting the authority of the Veda. No matter how wild a doctrine may be, if by any straining or twisting it can be brought into harmony with any sense of any text of the Veda, "*imprimatur*," it is orthodox. Heresy thus consists only in denying the doctrine of the Veda. But if any Vedic teaching is perfectly intelligible, it is the supremacy of the Brahmins. Their out-ranking of the Warrior or Princely caste—the Kshatrya—dates from the pre-historic periods. In the earliest times, far before written records, the Brahman walked before the king, and accounted himself superior to him. Many verses of the Veda set forth the wisdom and prosperity of the civil ruler who obeys the Brahman. Certainly there is in the annals of mankind no other instance of a class of men maintaining for more than three thousand years an almost uninterrupted supremacy over their countrymen. Thus the Brahmanic authority becomes the practical test of heresy. No matter what one denies, so long as he acknowledges *that*. No matter what he acknowledges so long as he denies *that*. The celebrated heresy of Buddha is a complete illustration of this matter. He—his full title is Buddha Sakya Muni—lived about 500 B. C. He was a Kshatri, one of the nobility of the land. Though he entered the Brahmanic caste, he uttered no doctrine but such as may be found in other commentators, yet

he opposed with all his might the assumptions of the Brahman. His followers say that he acknowledged the Veda as first given to the Rishis, but denied the Brahmanic comments. He certainly invaded the territory of the Brahmanic caste, and opposed their exclusive privileges. In so doing he was declared to have attacked the divine authority on which they rested, and was pronounced a heretic.

How uniform is the hierarchical temper in all ages and in all systems! The Brahman, the Pharisee, and the Pope, are tolerant or intolerant upon the same ground, the confession or denial of *authority*. That covers all other points. Buddhists and Brahmanists stand to each other in much the same relation in which the early Protestants stood to the Romanists, alike in so many things as to be peculiarly bitter in their actual differences. The effect of Buddha's teaching could have been produced only in an age of mental elasticity, near to the golden age of the Indian mind. Though addressed only to those classes who suffered most from Brahmanical pretensions, yet the intellectual freedom which it announced was welcome to many, and the result was after a while the complete temporary overthrow of Brahmanism. In breaking up the tyranny of an exclusive system, and giving a larger freedom of ideas to an extensive and cultivated society, Buddhism had a moral value, and may be regarded as a step toward Christianity. In following times a reaction took place. Brahmanism recovered its footing, Buddhism was driven out, and to-day it has on Indian soil not one devotee; yet it is the most prevalent religion in the world. In Eastern Asia, more than three hundred millions of people, some of the lowest of our race in morals, hold it the true system of faith and worship. Intrenched as it is, only Christianity can contend with it. The conflict begun by Dr. Judson in Burmah is continued at many points, not to be abandoned until the nations under its influence, as under the shadow of death, shall be fully brought to a better light and life.

The period in which Buddhism was developed is, as we have already stated, that of Sutras, "Strings," "Lines of Doctrine," composed for the preservation and transmission of the Veda. The traditional text of the Veda is called *Sakha*, a word also used to mean what we would call partial editions of the same

text. The Vedic labor is closely subdivided. The men devoted to the oral recitation of the Sakha, are called Charana. The various Charanas collected into a Brahmanic community, form a Parishad. Thus a Parishad resembles a European University, in which the Veda should be the grand study, the Charanas the separate faculties or departments, and the Sakhas the specific authorities or text-books. A complete Parishad consists of twenty-one Brahmans ; but three or four in a village, devoted to law, philosophy, theology, and keeping the fire of sacrifice, may form a Parishad.

The learning and preservation of the Veda being thus provided for, the work itself was divided into six elements, upon which its significance depends. These, called Vedangas, or members of the Veda, are, pronunciation, meter, grammar, etymology, astronomy, and the ceremonial. To most minds the Sutra system is interesting as a device for the preservation of literary works, perhaps previously to the art of writing, most certainly independently of it. The Homeric poems, brief, compared with the Vedic, vital and glowing with thoughts warmly sympathetic with those of the minds to which they were committed, were orally preserved for about three hundred years. The Vedic have been kept for two thousand years, and at this day, with all facilities for printing, the Brahman clings to his oral recitations to preserve his sacred inheritance. This is good evidence not only of industry, as we shall see, but of a wise and natural division of labor.

The Sutras of pronunciation suggest, that at a very early day the Pracrit or spoken dialect began to differ from the sacred language. The euphonic laws of the Sanscrit are very copious, showing great delicacy of ear ; and to have transmitted the euphonies of the language unimpaired for so many generations must have required the most careful attention.

The Sutras of meter illustrate the importance attached to the poetic form of the Veda. The earliest and most easily preserved monuments of literature are usually poetical. The meters of the Veda present very great variety and intricacy. The Sutras of grammar and etymology would both be included in our term grammar. For practical purposes the treatises of the native grammarians are cumbrous and fanciful. A

Brahman of to-day might learn his sacred tongue from the grammar of Prof. Williams, or of several who can be named, far better than from any method of his own countrymen. Yet it is to be remarked, that just before Aristotle developed in the Greek those ideas of general grammar on which we base the modern science, and to which we even owe its terms, from which, too, the systems of Arabian and Jewish grammarians were manifestly taken, the Hindoos had of themselves developed a grammatical science. The Greeks seized language as something objective, and treated it with philosophical accuracy, and hence the grasp of their system is sufficient and practicable for all languages, but they were slow in recognizing linguistic facts; only as late as Aristarchus do we find six parts of speech acknowledged. But with the Hindoos, fond of subjective contemplation, language, which indeed seems to contain in itself the germ of all sciences, early became a matter of wonder and meditation. The Goddess of Speech is in the Veda far more important and powerful than the Muses invoked by Homer. The songs of the Rishis contained truths on which all human welfare for all ages depended. It was therefore natural that the highest attention be paid to the vehicle by which those truths were conveyed. So thought was early turned, not only toward accuracy of pronunciation, but to the nature of language, and the organization of its elements. The earliest authors give full recognition to the facts of speech. The distinctions of nouns, verbs, prepositions, and particles, of numbers and cases, are quite scientifically stated. Katyayani, who wrote before the time of Plato, discusses nouns, verbs, derivatives, and compounds, more copiously and satisfactorily than the Cratylus. An extensive and curious discussion between two large schools, as to whether all nouns were derived from verbs, is ably rehearsed by Yaska, who decides that no general law can be proved, but that the derivation of each word is simply a matter of fact and history. There comparative philology is, even at this day, compelled to leave the question.

The fifth Vedanga is devoted to the rules concerning sacrifice. Its Sutas are the most complete and copious of all, being daily of practical value in the Brahmanic ritual. It has little to interest the general reader.

From the Sutras of the sixth Vedanga, we learn that a Sacred Calendar was early established, the moon being, as in most other countries, the measuring luminary. The intercalary month was recognized. The astronomical tables, to which the attention of the learned was called by Bailly, the value of which was perhaps overestimated, are no part of this Vedanga.

The sentences in these Sutras are brief and abrupt, "closely twisted like a rope," like those of an algebraic formula. They give only the skeletons of the elements above indicated, and all these depend for their explanation upon the commentaries. They need elucidation to the learner as much as the multiplication table to the tyro in arithmetic. Commentaries abound, and commentaries upon commentaries.

All these the Brahmans learn by heart, and invariably from oral recitation. The process of learning is extended over most of a lifetime. A Brahman seldom presumes to attempt more than one subject. He spends day after day and year after year under the guidance of his Guru, or teacher, learning a little daily, and constantly repeating, as a part of his daily devotions, from his former lessons, until he becomes in his turn a teacher. He is allowed to learn from the mouth of his Guru, and is cursed if he learn from written copies. "Those who write the Vedas, they shall go to hell," says the Mahabharata. Kumarila, a great authority, declares the knowledge of the truth worthless if it has been obtained from writing. Every Brahman learns for twelve years from the lips of his teacher. If he does not wish to marry, this time is lengthened to forty-eight years, all spent in hearing and rehearsing the ancient Vedic literature and its commentaries. How important in their view must be that to which such toil is given! and how vast the capacity of the human memory when put to its severest efforts! This known fact makes clear what is noticed by the Greek writers. Megasthenes says that the Indians had no written laws, but administered justice from memory. Nearchus tells us that the laws of the Indians were not put in writing. Yet they used letters for roadside inscriptions. This non-use of writing for literary purposes seems to have perplexed the Greeks, who, as far as they knew the Indians, certainly respected them as an intellectual people.

We have, in thus giving an outline of the Veda and the literature developed from it, indicated all that is of value in the Sanscrit language. Before the Christian era—the usual date of the *Sakuntala*—the fountain had ceased to flow. The Sanscrit ceased to be a living tongue, and was known only by its gigantic and well-preserved remains. To trace in later times the feebler workings of the Hindoo mind, after the old faith and its inspirings were lost in stupidities and depravities, is beyond the design of this paper.

We have spoken of the exclusive and aboriginal development of the Hindoo mind. It is possible that at one time it came in contact with Jewish civilization, and that at a very interesting epoch. The point of destination of Solomon's fleets, the rich and distant Ophir, has been a matter of perpetual conjecture. The words employed in Hebrew to designate two characteristic objects of import, "apes and peacocks," are of foreign, and apparently of Sanscrit, origin. At that time the intellect of India was in the rare state of development when a large and susceptible mind, like that of the Jewish king, would most readily receive impressions from it. The golden age of Israel seems to coincide with the golden age of Vedic thought. We know, too, that Solomon alone, of the Jewish kings, appreciated foreign civilization and invited foreign influences. We can thus far say, that the transfer of some intellectual impression along the track of commerce to the cosmopolitan mind of Solomon, is at least possible. If, now, we look still further, we find ascribed to Solomon two works whose tone and character stand in marked distinctness from all other Hebrew writings. We refer to *Ecclesiastes* and *Canticles*. The one, that profound and comprehensive essay in which the problem of human life is contemplated from every side, and its elements of sadness, delusion, and evanescence so vividly portrayed, must have been written on the soil of Palestine, perhaps not by Solomon. Yet it has a wonderfully Brahmanic tone, as if its key-note had been given by those Indian sages, who, above all others, were wont to turn from the frail and fading present to "rest and expatiate in a life to come."

The *Canticles*, that drama in which the virtuous steadiness of devoted love is so tenderly represented, shows still more of the non-Jewish, still more of the tone afterward exhibited in

the Sakuntala. We dismiss this discussion, perhaps to resume it elsewhere, with the remark that it is quite probable that we here find a positive, though unconscious, influence from India over the Jewish mind.

The introduction of the Sanscrit as a study into the institutions of this country is a question of practical interest. Our students must now learn it abroad; at least we know of but one American professorship of the language. Our collegiate courses are crowded, and our collegiate Faculties are continually perplexed to get into the curriculum some fair representation of the various branches of knowledge upon which the intellectual activity of our day is employed. Yet it is true of studies, as Webster once said of the legal profession, "There is always room enough in the upper story." If a new candidate can show sufficient claim, it should be admitted, whatever may be the competition. We believe that the Sanscrit should be introduced into some one of our Methodist colleges as a post-graduate study, or into some one of our theological schools. We would urge this, not for the sake of any literary treasures which it is known to contain, but solely for its linguistic and philological value.

The first class of persons who would profit by a course of instruction in Sanscrit, is composed of professional teachers of the classics. With these the writer is in sympathy. "*Et ego pictor.*" In spite of some small-voiced utilitarianism, we are a numerous class. Nearly five hundred are teaching Latin and Greek in schools under Methodist patronage. They have little popular sympathy, and little opportunity for fame or fortune. They must find their chief solace and satisfaction in their work, and no satisfaction is ampler than that from a conscious mastery over our subject-matter. A habit of referring Greek and Latin words to their older home in the roots of the Sanscrit, and of tracing the terminations to that vigorous and elastic tongue in which all are significant, makes the routine of the recitation room instructive and entertaining to the instructor. He finds himself lifted from the dullness of the drill, which long ago lost its novelty, "from these low grounds where sorrows dwell," to a lively, edifying, self-sustaining exercise, by which his own mind is continually expanded and illuminated. The slow melting of the high Sanscrit glacier keeps the

Greek and Latin on the lower slope constantly fresh and verdant.

So numerous are our teachers of classics, and so much is their work tending to become a profession for a life, that it may be expected that the college which shall first have facilities for acquiring the Sanscrit, will draw to itself a respectable number of graduates who will be desirous of a thorough professional preparation. The founding of a Sanscrit chair in any of our colleges, now so clearly desirable, not to say necessary, is worthy the attention of any large-minded patron who would give an impulse and a dignity to the cause of classical learning in our Methodist literary institutions. His name would be associated with a noble effort to put our classical and philological studies on a level with those of Europe.

The other class whom the establishment of a Sanscrit course in some of our theological schools might benefit, is composed of those who intend to become missionaries in India. The number of such may be expected to increase in subsequent years. As we have said, the Sanscrit is better understood, certainly better taught, in Berlin, Oxford, and Hertford, than in India. At this latter place it is learned by those who enter the Indian civil service. The Sanscrit, though not now spoken, is the basis of all the actual native tongues. He who has attained it may be said to have learned half of almost every vernacular in India; while he who is ignorant of it can never possess a perfect and critical understanding of any, though he may acquire a practical use of them. All abstract ideas are given in the Indian tongues by Sanscrit terms, and scarcely a sentence can be expressed with beauty and energy without its aid. It gives the foreigner a powerful prestige upon the native mind, if he can read and quote the Veda in its pure original language. The only question can be, whether a Sanscrit basis can be better laid in the training of a missionary here or upon the Indian soil. The example of the East India Company, in training its cadets at Hertford, is in favor of having Sanscrit taught at home. So practical a question admits of an early decision. It would surely give a look of broad and noble purpose to any of our theological schools, if it could be furnished with facilities for expounding that language, held sacred as the vehicle of faith and revelation by religions whose votaries

are more numerous, and whose rites and formulas are more ancient than those of any other upon earth, with which Christianity is to have its sternest, grandest pre-millennial battle.

The study of Sanscrit is difficult, but facilities for it are rapidly increasing. The best grammar for an English student is probably that of Prof. Williams, of Hertford; but Max Muller, Professor at Oxford, who is second to none as a Sanscrit scholar, is about to publish an Elementary Grammar and Chrestomathy, by which it is expected that the initial obstacles will be greatly reduced.

ART. III.—THE GREEK CHURCH IN ITS RELATION TO THE PROTESTANT.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

IN the arrangement of doctrines the early Christian Church pursued the logical order, placing first in the system the doctrine concerning God, or Theology. To this she was pressed by an external, as well as an internal (or philosophic) necessity. This accomplished, she turned her attention, with more or less vigor, to the doctrine concerning Man, or Anthropology. On the subject of anthropology in the first, second, and third centuries we shall find a greater degree of unanimity, greater clearness of statement, and evidences of more profound investigation than are generally accorded to the Fathers.

In this investigation the first question properly relates to the soul: Whence is it?

This question received three answers, only two of which gained much support. 1. The soul is pre-existent, and from its pre-existent state is brought into union with the body. 2. The soul is propagated with the body. 3. The soul is created and immediately united with the body.

These were severally styled the theory of pre-existence, of traduction, and of creation. The first theory was held by Origen of Alexandria, and by Numentius and Prudentius, and recently revived by the author of "*The Conflict of Ages*;" but was then, as it is now, almost universally discarded.

The second theory was first distinctly stated by Tertullian,

and afterward accepted by Gregory the Great, and Augustine, and Luther, and Edwards, and Samuel Hopkins.

Gerhard says, (Hagenbach, ii, § 116,) "*Animas eorum, qui ex Adamo et era progeniti fuissent, non creatas, neque etiam generatas, sed propagatas fuisse.*" And Hollaz declares: "*Anima humana hodie non immediate creatur, sed mediante semine fecundo a parentibus generatur et in liberos traditur.*" Again he says, The human soul is propagated by traduction.

The third theory, that the body, not the soul, is propagated from Adam, while a new soul is created at every human birth, was held by the Greek Fathers generally, by Jerome and Leo the Great, by Hilary of Pictavium, by the schoolmen of the Middle Ages, by Calvin, Beza, Bellarmine, Peter Martyr, etc., etc.

Indeed Augustine himself would not object to Creationism, if the problem of sin could be solved by it consistently with his opinion of the transmission of Adam's sin. This, Augustine held, logically involves (as Tertullian had perceived before him) the transmission of the sinning soul. (Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine, ii, 16.)

The Council of Constance, 540 A. D., ordained: '*Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπομέν λόγοις φάσκει τὴν ψυχὴν συνδημιουργηθῆναι τῷ σώματι καὶ οὐ τό μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ὑστέρον, κατὰ τὴν ὀργάνου φρενοβλαβειαν.*' (See Mansi, ix, p. 396.) Beza rejects Traducianism in these emphatic words: *Doctrina de animæ traduce mihi per absurda videtur.* Jerome declares Creationism the orthodox doctrine, (Epist. ad Pammachium, 397;) and Leo the Great styles it the doctrine of the Church. (Ep. 15, ad Turrib.) "Speaking generally, the theory of Creationism was the dominant one in the Eastern Church, and found advocates in the Western." (Shedd, ii, p. 11.) "The Scriptures," says Augustine, "give no decisive settlement of the question at issue between Creationism and Traducianism. Admitting original sin as guilt, we may deduce Traducianism after the manner of Gregory the Great; or, holding the doctrine of Traducianism, we may deduce the doctrine of original sin and guilt.

The next important inquiry is, What is the moral condition of the individual at birth?

The Traducianist will not be troubled in harmonizing his

theory with the doctrine of original sin, as guilt. It logically involves it, as we have just seen. But we confine ourselves now to the answer given by the advocates of Creationism, as this is, though not with perfect unanimity, the theory of the Greek Fathers. Platon in his "Orthodox Instruction," quoted by Masson, p. 44, says, "Man spiritually dead, receives through the operations of grace, spiritual life. For this reason, the Spirit, as the bestower of grace, is called the Lord and Giver of Life." According to the author of "A History of Christian Doctrine," ii, 19, "The soul as newly created (and it is newly created in every individual instance according to the creationist) cannot be anything but a pure and perfect soul. It cannot be tainted with evil of any kind." The advocates of both theories agree in locating sin in the soul, hence we should not expect Creationists to admit the doctrine of original sin as guilt. At the same time it is proper to remark that the theory of Pelagius, which rejected the doctrine of original sin in any definition of it, was condemned by the Eastern as well as by the Western Church.

The Fathers of the Alexandrine School—the two Gregories, the two Cyrils, Athanasius and Basil—admitted universal corruption inherited from Adam, which they called original sin, but which they did not consider culpable, imposing upon infants a universal tendency to actual sin, but not imparting guilt. With this coincided the doctrine of the School of Antioch—Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theodore of Mopsuestia—that the human race by their physical descent from Adam had inherited, not sin as guilt, but corruption, evil which carried with it a universal tendency to sin. Chrysostom would allow that corruption and mortality are transmissible from parent to child, from Adam to the race, but that sin and guilt are not thus transmissible. This became the general doctrine of the Eastern Church. Indeed, up to the opening of the fifth century, the Church, both East and West, generally held the doctrine of an inherited corruption as distinguished from an inherited guilt. (Shedd, ii, 39.) According to the same authority, this general type of doctrine, under new forms and names, has perpetuated itself in the Eastern Church down to the present time. In the light of these statements and definitions we perceive the import of the Longer (Russian) Catechism

in reply to the question, "Why did not the first man, only, die, and not all, as now?" Answer: "Because all have come of Adam since his infection by sin, and all sin in themselves." As from an infected source there naturally flows an infected stream, so from a father infected with sin, and consequently mortal, there naturally proceeds a posterity infected like him with sin, and like him mortal." Creationism does not allow that the soul is propagated from Adam, but is newly created. But all else, as it is propagated, or flows from this infected stream, is itself infected and corrupt. There is, in the language of the Greek Fathers, original sin, but not guilt; inherited corruption, but not culpability. As Chrysostom taught, corrupt mortal Adam begets corrupt mortal offspring. "How is this spoken of in the Holy Scriptures?" the Longer Catechism inquires. The answer is (Rom. v, 12): "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." And so, precisely, answers Chrysostom with this explanation: "No one owes anything to justice until he first becomes a sinner for himself. What then is the meaning of the word *ἁμαρτολοί*, in the phrase 'were made sinners?' It seems to me to denote liability to suffering and death." This explanation of Chrysostom is perfectly consistent with his theory of Creationism, which does not allow that the voluntary part, the human soul, is derived from Adam. But as there was not among the early Greek Fathers complete unanimity in this view and its logical consequences, (for example, Gregory of Nyssa advocated Traducianism,) so there is some diversity among the modern Greek Christians: Philaret, for example, speaks of "evil desires, or the first efforts of the will to sin, as a sin meriting God's wrath;" intimating, perhaps, the doctrine of original sin as guilt; while Platon and Stourdza have been said to lean toward Traducianism.

Of the three theories, then, that fallen Adam transmitted to his posterity, 1, inherited sin and guilt, 2, inherited corruption only, with a universal tendency to sin, 3, merely a bad example, the second is the general doctrine of the Greek Church. Greek theologians of a later period, like John Damascene of the eighth century, followed by Nicholas of Methone and others, admitted "a deterioration of the moral

power of man, but retained the earlier notions concerning human liberty."

John of Damascus taught that the effect of the fall brought man into a physical state of labor and trial, subjecting him to pain, dissolution, and death; and left him morally despoiled of divine grace, and deprived of confidence toward God: *γυμνωθεὶς τῆς χάριτος καὶ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν παρρησίαν ἀπεκ δυνάμενος*.—*De Fide Orthodoxa*, Lib. iii, c. 1.

The Confession of Dositheus (1672 A. D.) Art. VI, declares: "We believe that the first man created by God fell, in paradise, . . . and thence flowed in succession original sin, so that no one is born according to the flesh who does not bear this burden, and does not feel its fruits [effects] in this life. But the fruits which we call sin, which take place by a wicked choice, are against the divine will and not of nature, for many, like John the Harbinger and the Virgin Mary, were not thus tempted." Again, "As no one can be saved without holy baptism, John iii, 5, it is essentially necessary also for infants, because they also are subject to original sin."

We are now prepared to advance one step farther, and inquire: What is the theory of the Greek Church in regard to the human will since the Fall? This question does not relate to the primeval condition of the will, for all admit, even Augustine, that anterior to the Fall the human will was free toward good and evil. The Longer Catechism asserts: God of his goodness at the creation of man gave him a will naturally disposed to love God, but still free; and man used this freedom for evil. The Council of Bethlehem, (1672 A. D.), in the fourteenth article of the Ultimatum sent to the English bishops, speaking of man since the Fall, explicitly declares, "that he has the same nature in which he was created, and the energy of that nature, which is free will living and acting, so that by nature he can choose and do good, and avoid and hate evil. . . . In the third article, from which we have already quoted, in regard to predestination or fore-ordination, founded on foreknowledge, the freedom of the will is distinctly recognized, and the using of that free will well or ill is designated as the ground of the divine approval or condemnation. Proceeding to explain the use of the free will, it speaks of inceptive grace bestowed upon all, but "which does not benefit those not

willing to obey it, but those willing." Whereas, "those who are not willing to obey . . . but who abuse the free will which they received from God for the purpose of willingly performing what was good, are given up to everlasting condemnation." Again, whatever God does for us "does not take away the act of willing or not willing to obey." Much more of like import might be quoted from the same article. Some passages in the Longer Catechism seem to clash with this statement of the Greek patriarchs; for example, "Man cannot really do good works, unless he receive, through faith in Jesus Christ, spiritual strength." But the general doctrine is that this gift is conditioned upon the acceptance or rejection of the free will.

Again, on "The Duty of Parish Priests," speaking of the petition, "Thy will be done," it is said we are directed to ask our heavenly Father that he would put into our hearts the desire and the power to do his will. But by the general doctrine this gift again is conditioned upon our willingness to receive it. There is really no collision. The existence of a free will is quite different from the question whether a free will surrounded by corruption and mortality can, unaided, do all that God desires of us. Keeping the two distinct, and ascertaining the theory of the Greek theologians in regard to the former, we shall be prepared for their solution of the latter. There are apparent exceptions to the theory of a free will. Michael, Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Novogorod, in his sermon on Eph. ii, 8, 9, says that "a carnal man not only cannot do what is good, he cannot even will it." And Philaret, the Metropolitan of Moscow, asserts that man in his natural, corrupt state has liberty in choice of natural, civil, and moral good; but for spiritual and saving operations he has no free will and power. However, he appends this remark, that the law is designed to reveal to man his weakness, that he may unconditionally give himself up to grace; implying that all turns finally upon the decisive act of the free will. But all these statements may be readily harmonized with the Greek theory of the existence of a free will, which yet needs the inceptive grace of God to withstand the surrounding influences of corruption, the artifices of Satan, and the allurements of the world, and which is free in accepting or rejecting this grace.

This theory accords with the view of Chrysostom, already

referred to, that the will is an attribute of the soul which is not derived from Adam, but directly from God himself, and therefore is not vitiated or deprived of its freedom by the sin of Adam.

Hagenbach, i, § 108, states that "the doctrine of the freedom of the will was distinctly maintained by the Greek Church," and cites especially Gregory of Nazianzum, (to whom Augustine appealed in preference to all others,) Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraim the Syrian, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom, who insisted, most of all, upon the liberty of man, and his moral self-determination, and these are especial authorities in the Greek Church at the present day. In the second and third centuries both the Eastern and the Western Churches were strongly emphatic in asserting the doctrine of human freedom, (Shedd, ii, b. iv, c. ii.) And says Justin Martyr, "Unless we suppose that man has it in his power to choose the good and refuse the evil, no one can be accountable for any action whatever." I might quote from Clement and Origen, from Theophilus and Irenæus, in illustration of this same view of free will. The same doctrine was reasserted by John of Damascus in the eighth century, as well as by the other Greek theologians down to Nicholas of Methone, (see Ullman, l. c, p. 86.) On this doctrine there is indeed a general agreement among the earlier and later fathers of the Greek Church, (Hag., i, 157.) Says Clement of Alexandria: "Man, like every other spiritual being, can never lose the power of arbitrary (free, unnecessitated) choice." So Origen teaches that "the human will sustains a like relation to moral good and moral evil;" that is, the will in itself is free toward one or the other. At the same time this consists readily with the fact of vicious surroundings which allure and entice to sin, the will acting freely and responsibly.

What now is the doctrine of the Greek Church in regard to the work of regeneration? Is it monergistic or synergistic, effected by a co-operative, or by a single agency?

Even those Greek Fathers who insisted most strongly upon human freedom, like Clement of Alexandria, strictly inculcated the necessity of gracious assistance in the work of regeneration: God co-operates with those souls that are willing. As the physician furnishes health to that body which synergizes toward health, (by a recuperative energy of its own,) so God

furnishes eternal salvation to those who synergize toward the knowledge and obedience of the truth." Herein Clement unquestionably teaches that this work is effected only as man turns receptively toward the proffered aid. The agency implied is clearly synergistic. John i, 12, and similar passages, are cited as illustrative of this view: "As many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God." This is no less definitely stated by Justin Martyr, (*Apol.*, i, 10:) "God only persuades and draws us gently in our regeneration by co-operating freely with those rational powers which he has bestowed upon us." And Origen taught that the human will is the ultimate efficient, and accordingly receives the divine approval or condemnation. Hence the divine appeal: "Whosoever will, let him come. I called, and ye refused. I would have gathered you . . . but ye would not," etc. The statement of Chrysostom accords with this view: "If man, upon his side, works toward holiness, God's grace will come in to succor and strengthen him." Commenting on the passage, Rom. x, 16, "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy," Chrysostom says this indicates that the whole power is not of man. Assisting grace is needed from above.

But these citations of the Greek Fathers may be summed up in one general statement by one whose testimony in this direction is unquestionably impartial: "Until the opening of the fifth century the Church, both east and west, not only held the doctrine of an inherited corruption as distinguished from an inherited guilt, but also held the doctrine of synergistic regeneration. (Shedd, ii, 197.)

Afterward, as is well known, the monergism of Augustine prevailed in the west, till in the middle ages it was in turn superseded by Semi-Pelagianism, which taught, like Eastern Orthodoxy, inherited corruption and Synergistic Regeneration. Since the Reformation the Greek and Latin theories may be recognized under the modern Protestant names, but with historic identity.

The later position of the Greek Church on this position is stated fully and clearly by the Synod of Bethlehem, A. D. 1672, which statement was republished by the Synod of Russia in 1838 A. D.

Article III declares, "We understand the use of the free will thus: 'That divine and enlightening grace, which also we call inceptive, by the divine goodness affords light to all in darkness who are disposed to obey it . . . but those who are not willing to obey and consent to this grace, and who for this reason do not do what God wishes us to perform, and by the artifices of Satan abuse the free will which they received from God for the purpose of willingly performing what was good, are given up to everlasting condemnation.'"

"God alone is the cause of salvation according to the enlightening grace which he gives previous to the supposed works . . . but this does not take away the act of willing to obey him."

Here again the human will is regarded as the final efficient, acting freely and responsibly, and so receiving approbation if accepting, condemnation if rejecting. In this position the Greek patriarchs unquestionably agree with the Greek Fathers like Justin Martyr and Cyprian, who taught that the benefits of redemption are secured by the merits of the Divine Redeemer, but that they are to be appropriated by a free act of the human agent.

We pass now to consider the doctrine of Redemption as held by the Greek Church. This, in its various relations, is a question of vital importance in this discussion, and must evermore be regarded by Protestants with intense interest. To guide us we have some explicit declarations made by authority, and approved by modern synodical councils.

Article VIII of the Confession of the Patriarch Dositheus, approved by the Synod of Bethlehem, declares: "We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ became the only Mediator, and gave himself up as a ransom for all, to make by his own blood a reconciliation between God and man; and that he, having care of his own, [people,] is the advocate and the propitiation for our sins."

In reference to Christ's sufferings and death, the Shorter Russian Catechism declares: "We believe that he endured all this, [namely, sin and death,] not for himself, being wholly innocent and sinless, but for us; that is, he endured all the penalties due to all the sins of men, and death itself, in order to deliver us from sin and death."

The Longer Catechism, after asserting that Christ's sacrifice of himself was voluntary, and confirming it by reference to John x, 17, 18, affirms that by his death on the cross Christ delivered us from sin, the curse, and death, citing proofs from Scripture. Of deliverance from sin, Eph. i, 7; of deliverance from the curse, Gal. iii, 13; of deliverance from death, Heb. ii, 14, 15. Then, with discrimination, it answers the question, "How does the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross deliver us from sin, the curse, and death? Christ is the second Adam, the new Almighty Head of men, whom he unites to himself through faith. His voluntary suffering and death on the cross for us being of infinite value and merit as the death of one sinless, God and man in one person, is both a perfect satisfaction to the justice of God which hath condemned us to death for sin, and a fund of infinite merit, which has obtained him the right, without prejudice to justice, to give us sinners pardon of our sins, and grace to have victory over sin and death."

The authorities just quoted are explicit in teaching the universality of the atonement. The Confession of Dositheus, Article VIII, declares that our Lord Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for all. The Longer Catechism proposes this question: "Was it for us all, strictly speaking, that Jesus Christ suffered?" and answers thus: "For his part he offered himself as a sacrifice strictly for all, and obtained for all grace and salvation; but this benefits only those of us who for their parts, of their own free will, have fellowship in his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death. Phil. iii, 10."

"The Duty of Parish Priests" directs them to teach that it is clearly shown in the Scriptures that God willeth not the death of the sinner, but is willing to save all, even every one, citing 1 Tim. ii, 4; Ezek. xxxiii, 11.

Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, and Professor of Divinity in the Spiritual Academy, states in his "Comparison of Doctrines," Art. XII: "The sufferings and death of Christ are an abundant satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Eph. v, 25-27." Upon this point, so far as I have observed, there is unanimity in the Greek Church.

That the atonement is the ground of salvation, and that faith is a means of justification, is distinctly taught; but upon the question, Whether faith in Christ is the only means of justifi-

cation, there is a variety of utterances. Yet this, among Protestants, is the recognized test of evangelicity. It was a principle with Luther to be tolerant toward ceremonies, but to insist upon this confession, that sin is pardoned on account of God's Son, and that man receives this blessing through faith. D'Aubigné asserts that the Church had fallen because the great doctrine of Justification by Faith had been lost. Whenever this fundamental truth shall be restored, all the errors and devices which have usurped its place will be banished.

The ultimatum of the Synod of Bethlehem, Art. IX, declares: "We believe that no one is saved without faith. By faith we mean the most correct opinion we have concerning God and divine things, which working by love, that is to say, by the divine commandments, justifies us before Christ; and without this it is impossible to please God." Art. XIII has been adduced as contradicting this: "We believe that man is not justified through faith alone, but through faith working by love, that is to say, by faith and works. . . . But we understand works not as witnesses, confirming our calling, but as fruits in themselves, through which faith becomes effectual, and being in themselves worthy by the divine promise," etc., etc.

The Longer Catechism, after declaring that the atonement can benefit only those who, of their own free will, have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Christ, inquires, "How can we have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ?" The reply is: "We have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ through a lively faith, through the sacraments in which is contained and sealed the virtue of his sufferings and death; and, lastly, through the crucifixion of our flesh with its affections and lusts." Gal. ii, 19, 20; Rom. vi, 3; 1 Cor. xi, 26; Gal. v, 24.

Here are two specific and important exceptions to the evangelical doctrine of Justification by Faith only, opening at once to all the excesses of sacramental efficacy and meritorious penance. Here sacraments and good works are placed on a level with faith in saving efficacy, for they, equally with faith, bring us into saving relations to Christ. This is radically different from the evangelical doctrine, that by true faith we have fellowship with our Lord Jesus Christ, and through his merits are

pardoned and justified, and henceforth, with the new life of faith, bring forth fruits unto righteousness, and the end everlasting life.

I pause here to give a single illustration of the legitimate and evil consequences to which this heretical theory leads, reserving the privilege of recurring to this point again. "The Duty of Parish Priests," Art. XIV, chap. 3, ordains that any person, by whose negligence a child dies unbaptized, is, by canon 68 of the *Nomocanon*, to be withheld from the communion for three years, and must do penance by two hundred prostrations daily, and fast the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday in every week. Art. XVIII directs that children baptized in infancy, upon growing up are to be taught, among other things, that in baptism "they received remission of their sins; that they put on the new man; that the white robe given them at their baptism signified the innocence with which they were then endued," etc.

Again the catechism inquires: "Is not faith alone enough for a Christian, without love and good works?" The reply is: "No; for faith without love and good works is inactive and dead, and so cannot lead to eternal life."

Yet it is proper to remark that we meet with occasional expressions of better promise in some works of partial authority, and from some individuals of apparently evangelical tendencies. Philaret, for example, in his "Comparison of Doctrines," Art. XIII, says: "Grace justifies through the power of the merits of Jesus Christ, which a man receives by living faith. Good works are the fruits of faith and grace, and therefore they do not constitute in man any kind of personal merit. Rom. iii, 23-28; Luke xvii, 10." A remark made upon this article by the author explains the declaration of the apostle James, "That by works is faith made perfect," thus: "The apostle shows justification in faith and works like the life in the root and fruit of the tree; so faith represents the root of justification. . . . The present difference of opinion between the Eastern and Western [that is, the Latin] Churches on this point refers more to the abstract principle than to active Christianity, because they are both agreed as to the obligation to good works; but those who find merit in their good works stand on pharisaical ground." A similar sentiment is found in

the Liturgy of St. Basil, (Neale, ii, 567,) in the prayer of the priests, "who are thought worthy by thee to serve at thy holy altar, not according to our righteousness, for we have done nothing good upon earth, but according to thy mercies," etc. And even "The Duty of Parish Priests" enjoins that they direct the penitent, who asks mercy of God, to have before his eyes Jesus Christ crucified, and trust only to his merits for the remission of sin; that they exhort the sick to cling with all his heart to Christ alone; that they present to the dying those texts which assure us that the sinner who repenteth is justified solely by God's grace, through lively and saving faith, and by none other thing whatever, citing Rom. iii, 24, 25; Ephes. ii, 8, 9; 1 John i, 7; Heb. x, 19; that they teach that lively and saving faith is essential to proper communion, and necessary in prayer; that confession without faith in Christ, which in the strictest and most proper sense means trust in Christ's merits, is no less dead than a body without a soul, for example, the confession of Judas. "How indeed," it asks, "should not faith be necessary to repentance when it has such virtue that of itself it brings peace to the troubled sinner, and frees him entirely from condemnation to torment? Rom. v, 1; viii, 1."

I might quote in this connection from the sermons of the eloquent Greek, Enconomus, the leader of the High Church party in Greece, delivered in Russia, 1833, and published in Berlin; or from those of the celebrated Russian, Procopovitch. But however interesting and encouraging may be the statements of individuals and inferior authorities, they are, to say the least, quite inconclusive.

Another article of faith relates to the Church. The Nicene Constantinopolitan Creed contains doctrines that are deemed essential by eastern orthodoxy. These are great spiritual truths, the objects not of sight, but of faith; they are therefore properly introduced by the phrase, I believe. The ninth article of this creed is stated thus: "I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

This indicates a spiritual conception of the true Church, of which Christ is the Head; which is sanctified by the same spiritual baptism, and united by saving faith to its divine Head, and thus holds real but invisible fellowship. It also suggests a careful and constant discrimination between the invisible

Church and the visible. This discrimination and this spirituality of conception are characteristic of the Protestant idea of the Church, manifest in German, Helvetic, Gallic, and Anglican confessions from Luther to Wesley. The Protestant distinction between the invisible and the visible Church is applied to the real and apparent here in time. The Greek, on the contrary, seems to disregard this distinction, and to assign to the invisible Church only those believers who have departed this life, and to the visible all those who remain. The Longer Catechism remarks on the ninth article: "We believe that the Church is invisible so far as she is partially in heaven, and contains all those who have departed hence in true faith and holiness."

This visible Church, then, is one. What is it, and who are its members? Art. IX of the Confession of Dositheus replies: "We believe that all the faithful, and only they, are members of the Catholic Church, that is to say, those who without doubting profess the unblemished faith of our Saviour Jesus Christ, (as shown by Christ himself and the apostles, and the Holy Ecumenical Councils,) although some of them may be guilty of manifold sins." While Art. X asserts: "We believe that the so-called, or rather which is the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in which we have been taught to believe, contains all the faithful in Christ who manifestly up to this time and now, being in their earthly pilgrimage, have not departed to their [heavenly] country."

We do not say that the orthodox Greek would formally assume that his is the only Christian Church, and condemn all others; but the theoretical probabilities are certainly threatening, and I know not that any practical proofs to the contrary have been furnished.

"How does it agree with the unity of the Church," asks the Longer Catechism on the ninth article, "that there are many separate and independent Churches, as those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Russia?" Ans. "These are particular Churches or parts of the one Catholic Church. The unity is expressed outward by unity of creed, and by communion in prayer and sacraments." These are the sacraments, the liturgy, and the creed unquestionably of the orthodox Greek Church, so that the answer as well as the

question ignores any other Christian Church, and comports precisely with the most exclusive interpretation of the standards already quoted. But to proceed. What is the essential to Church organization? Art. X. of the Confession of Dositheus replies that the episcopal office is necessary to the Church, and without him [a bishop] no Church can exist, nor can any one be called or be a Christian. . . . We consider him as necessary to the Church as breath is to a man, and as the sun is to the world. . . . He rejects from the Church as heathen and publicans those who disobey, and subjects heretics to excommunication and a curse." Terms more significant of exclusiveness could not easily be found. The practice would need to be far more liberal than the creed to relieve the "Orthodox Church" of this charge. But to be more explicit still, the Longer Catechism inquires: "If the Catholic Church contains all true believers in the world, must we not acknowledge it to be necessary for salvation that every believer should belong to her?" The reply is: "Exactly so, since Jesus Christ, in the words of St. Paul, is the Head of the Church, and he is the Saviour of the body; it follows that to have part in his salvation we must necessarily be members of his body, that is, of the Catholic Church." According to this view, as has been aptly said by another in a somewhat similar connection, individuals come to Christ through the Church; while in the Protestant view they come to the Church through Christ." This suggests another vicious principle in this High Church theory, namely, the episcopal or priestly medium of grace, or, in relation to man, the episcopal control of grace. Says the Confession of Dositheus, Art. X: "He, the bishop, as a successor of the apostles . . . by the fullest energy of the consecrating spirit, is the source of all the mysteries of the Catholic Church, through which [mysteries] we obtain salvation."

Logically and directly related to this is the vicious notion of sacramental efficacy, as the same article declares: "Christ is joined to us through the sacred mysteries of which the bishop is the first author and consecrator through the Spirit." An illustration in point is furnished by the Longer Catechism: "The Apostle Peter writes that baptism saveth us after the figure of the ark of Noah. All who were saved from the general deluge were saved only in the ark, so all who obtain

everlasting salvation, obtain it only in the one Catholic Church."

This is taught in "The Duty of Parish Priests," where they are directed to instruct those baptized in childhood that they then received remission of their sins; while neglecting to baptize a dying child is a crime to be punished by severe penance, as already specified.

The same external visible idea of the Church is manifest in the Greek interpretation of the term apostolic in the ninth article of the creed. The Greek Church appropriates to herself this attribute of the true Church, as well as those just named, because she claims to have "from the apostles, without break or change, both her doctrine and the succession of the gifts of the Holy Ghost through the laying on of consecrated hands." The same claim is asserted by the Confession of Dositheus, Art. X. Precisely how this is proved does not appear. The task is quietly shirked by the catechism. The Confession makes a rash attempt to establish the claim, partly by argument, partly by history; yet it completes neither line of evidence, as if it doubted the decisiveness of each, and hoped that two inconclusive proofs might be accepted as equivalent to one demonstration. To this succession (so forcibly maintained) attaches the inheritance of apostolic office and authority. Although the Greek Hierarchy does not rise to the arrogant height of the papacy, yet it certainly is not remarkable for modesty. The high priest (for so he is called in the standards) claims to be the source of the sacred mysteries and gifts; that he alone can consecrate the holy oil, and ordain all other orders and grades in the Church, and, in the first and higher sense, bind and loose, and that his decisions are well received by God.

The chief divisions of the Greek Church, like those of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, are under the authority of patriarchs; or, like those of Russia and Greece, are governed by synods. Then follow in succession metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, constituting three orders in the ministry. To this system the "Orthodox Church" clings with desperate zeal. When, a few years since, the presence of the Presbyterian mission in Greece was thought to endanger the safety of the Greek Hierarchy, suspicion was

cast upon some of the priests as favoring the new policy. In consequence a defense of the three orders was published. Bambas and Pharmakades replied, and the latter maintained that the primitive form was not hierarchal but democratic. But the attempt at reform was fruitless. Still Greece has gained something ecclesiastically through her civil revolution. In her new constitution she has ordained her independence of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate. So Russia relieved herself of ecclesiastical dependence by the imperial demand of Peter the Great. It is evident, then, that the government of the Greek Church is not centralized like that of the papal, but is shared by several equal independent agencies, and that it is not immutable in form, since in some provinces it is patriarchal, in others synodical. These several governing agencies, convoked in one general assembly, constitute an Œcumenical Council, whose authority extends over the whole Church, and is at once supreme and universal. But, unlike the vaulting ambition of the papacy, it does not presume to stretch beyond the Church. Neither patriarch nor synod nor council has ever affected temporal sovereignty or superiority over civil rulers.

One ecclesiastical vice, however, attaches to œcumenical councils which we cannot too strongly reprobate: the assumption of infallibility. This is by no means a merely nominal claim, timidly preferred. On the contrary, it is asserted with authority and openly admitted by the Church. The Confession of Dositheus, Art. XIII, declares that as the primitive Church was taught by the Holy Spirit through the apostles and prophets, so now the Church is taught indeed by the life-giving Spirit, but by means of the holy Fathers and teachers, of whom the œcumenical holy synods are considered the rule. We also confess without doubt, as true and certain, that it is impossible for the Catholic Church to err or wander at all, or ever to choose falsehood instead of truth. For the all-holy Spirit ever operating through the holy Fathers and rulers faithfully ministering, frees the Church from errors of every kind whatsoever." This at once exalts the council (the fathers and rulers) to an equality with the apostles in inspiration and authority; and precisely comports with, and verifies what I have already shown in regard to her rule of faith and practice, that the modern Greek Church accepts tradition as not inferior to Scrip-

ture. This tradition has been and will be augmenting. Who can conjecture the limit of its unfolding, or its possible accumulation of errors and corruptions? Already it has vitiated the standard of doctrine which is the *formative* principle of the Church. Already it has destroyed her evangelicity, by corrupting her *material* principle—the doctrine of faith; and has falsified her *governing* principle by the assumption of infallibility. But more than this. It has multiplied her sacraments, and surcharged them with saving efficacy; introduced transubstantiation into the communion; produced baptismal regeneration, Mariolatry, the invocation of saints, the worship of pictures, auricular confession and penance, priestly absolution and prayers for the dead. This will appear as we proceed.

I need pause but a moment to speak of the division of the clergy into higher and lower; and the lower clergy into sacred and secular, or black and white. The former only are eligible to promotion. The latter are restricted to parochial duties. These are required to be married before entering upon their profession. On the death of his wife a secular priest may qualify himself for promotion by renouncing matrimony and entering a monastic institution. The higher clergy—bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs, are selected from among the monks. The monks consist of priests and laity; the latter attend to worldly affairs, the former to religious duties. The monastic institution is rather lay than clerical, and is not, as in the papal Church, a gigantic enginery of the priesthood, yielding a special support to the papacy; neither do like throngs of mendicant monks infest the Greek Church. Stourdza tells us that the monastic system is founded on the vicarious principle, the monks sacrificing themselves for the good of others: *L'Institution des ordres monastiques n'est fondée que sur l'idée fondamentale d'une expiation volontaire d'un innocent pour le coupable.*

The bishops are regarded as “holocausts smoking on the high places—practicing celibacy in order to perfect the holiness of the sacrifice.” Thus while the Greek Church dogmatically discards the doctrine of human supererogation she practically inculcates it. The principle is as false as the practice is fatal. Though the monastic system of the East has never been invested with the splendor and importance attached to it in the

West, yet we readily see that it is encouraged by the comfortable independence which it commands, by the sanctity which attends it, by the opportunity for seclusion and study, and by the hypocrisy and fanaticism of devotees. With one or two exceptions the converts adopt the same rule—the rule of St. Basil. This uniformity, Stourdza zealously declares, has preserved the Greek Church from the multiplied evils of the Latin, prominent among which is the Reformation! Her reverence for the past and her dread of reform conspire to beget in the Greek Church suspicion and dislike of Protestantism. Fear of disturbance toward her ecclesiastical repose of centuries, and her undisputed sway over the conscience and creed of her communicants, has hitherto repelled her from the advances of Protestant progress. Her movements have been retrograde. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Council, which she especially delights to honor, recognized the supremacy of the Scriptures as the final arbiter of dispute. The Greek Church has since officially declared that tradition is of equal authority. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed, which every Protestant cordially accepts, she has disfigured with appendages till its identity can scarcely be recognized. She has increased the number and nature of the sacraments till their original simplicity and significance are quite lost, and primitive spiritual worship has shared a similar fate. The two divinely authorized sacraments have been increased to seven, so that instead of Baptism and the Lord's Supper the Greek Church has ordained the Eucharist, Baptism, Chrism, Confession or Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction.

That Transubstantiation is the doctrine of the modern Greek Church cannot be reasonably questioned. Not indeed until the fourteenth century, as we are told, (Mosh., 321,) was the term introduced by Innocent III. And not until the Council of Bethlehem did the Greek Church allow the use of the word *μετουσίωσις* to signify the change wrought, by consecration, in the eucharistic elements. Now Stourdza asserts the dogma of the Real Presence under the transformed elements of bread and wine, as that of his Church, with some expression of astonishment that any doubt can exist respecting its truth. The words of the Oriental Confession are even more explicit: "When the priest consecrates the elements (gifts) the very

substance of the bread and of the wine is transformed into the substance of the true body and blood of Christ." In the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, so commonly employed in the communion service, the ceremony is called an *oblation* or *sacrifice*; and the prayer made by the deacon on receiving the sacrament contains these words: "I believe that this is thy most pure body indeed, and that this is thy holy blood indeed."

If it be objected that these are private opinions, not authoritative, we reply that authorized proofs are abundant. The Longer Catechism asks, "What is the communion?" and answers, "The communion is a sacrament in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very body and blood of Christ to everlasting life." And again: "The word Transubstantiation defines not the manner of the change, but the fact that the bread really, truly, and substantially becomes the very true body of the Lord, and the wine the very blood of the Lord." And this forms the chief and most essential part of the religious service. "The Duty of Parish Priests" enjoins, in regard to the Holy Communion, that before administering it the priest duly instruct them that wish to communicate that, "This, the body and blood of Christ, is not only in name what it is called, but also verily and indeed is his body and his blood under the forms of bread and wine." Upon this point proofs might be multiplied; but already is the conclusion inevitable.

My plan involved a review of the *practice* of the Greek Church in regard to Baptism, Confession, Penance, Worship of Pictures, Fasts and Feasts, Honoring Saints, praying for them and through them, Mariolatry, Exorcism, Prayer for the Dead, Absolution for the Dead, etc., etc. But such a review would necessarily be of considerable length, and therefore we dismiss it with the single remark, that the practice is more obnoxious than is the faith of "Eastern orthodoxy" to criticism.

Are there, then, no alleviating considerations, and no hopeful indications in the principles and policy of the Greek Church? In previous articles we have recognized and specified many; and no one who has read those articles will suspect us of hostile prejudice toward the Greek Church. As we have shown, in comparison with the Latin Church she has much advantage. In discarding all temporal jurisdiction she occupies Protestant

ground. In her general toleration she is well-nigh Protestant. And in her immutable hostility to the Papacy she presents a strong and steady counterpoise to Roman Catholic ambition.

At the close of this discussion we meet this practical question: Is an immediate Protestant union with the Greek Church desirable? By no means, we reply. Until she shall have eliminated the fiction of an infallible tradition from an equality with the Scriptures as her rule of faith and practice, we would withdraw and reject every proposal of union. Until she shall have amended her formal confessions and authorized standards in harmony with the word of God, we would withhold and reject every proposal of union. Until she shall have reformed in faith and practice in obedience to the divine rule, we would withhold and reject every proposal of union.

ART. IV.—CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE chronology of the Old Testament is rendered uncertain, chiefly on account of a diversity of readings in the original Hebrew text, and in the Septuagint. According to the Hebrew, the deluge occurred in the year of the world 1656; according to the Septuagint, in 2242. According to the Hebrew, Abraham was born in the year of the world 2008; according to the Septuagint, in the year 3334. According to the Hebrew, our Saviour was born in the year of the world 4000 or thereabouts; according to the Septuagint, in the year 5426.

These differences in chronology are the result, not of accident, but of design. This is evident from the very nature of them. Either the Masorites designedly *lessened* the chronology of the Old Testament, after the Septuagint translation was made, or the Septuagint translators, or some of their copyists, have designedly *lengthened* this chronology beyond that of the original Hebrew text.

The differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint occur chiefly in the ages of the patriarchs, and they are in this wise: The Septuagint makes the life of the patriarch, at the birth of his genealogical son, one hundred years longer than the Hebrew. And then it makes his life, subsequent to the

son's birth, one hundred years shorter than the Hebrew; so that the whole life of the patriarch, in both copies, is the same. Thus the Hebrew makes Adam 130 years old at the birth of Seth; but the Septuagint makes him 230. The Hebrew makes Seth 105 years old at the birth of Enos; the Septuagint 205. The Hebrew makes Enos 90 years old at the birth of Cainan; the Septuagint 190. The Hebrew makes Cainan 70 years old at the birth of Mahalaleel; the Septuagint 170. And so, with few exceptions, the different accounts proceed; the Septuagint adding one hundred years to the life of the patriarch, at the time of the birth of his genealogical son, almost to the time of Abraham. Meanwhile, one hundred years are taken from the age of the patriarch after the birth of his son, leaving his whole life, in both copies, the same. Now it is obvious that alterations such as these could never have been made accidentally. Whichever copy may have been changed, the change must have been effected with design.

Which of these copies, then, is to be preferred? Which account is to be accepted as the true chronology of the Bible?

In favor of the Septuagint chronology it is urged that it agrees, in general, with that of Josephus. And as Josephus was acquainted with both the Hebrew and Greek, and had both copies before him at the time of writing his history, it is to be presumed that both, at that time, were what the Septuagint now is. But this argument, though plausible, is far from being conclusive. It is true that the chronology of Josephus, so far as recorded in his *Antiquities*, (Book i, chap. 3,) agrees nearly, though not entirely, with that of the Septuagint; but Ernesti and Michaelis both tell us that this passage in Josephus has been altered, to make it agree with the Seventy, by transcribers who had been accustomed to read the Scriptures only in the Greek version. And we have this evidence that what these critics tell us is true, that Josephus, in another place, where he has escaped the hands of false correctors, makes the time which elapsed between the creation and the deluge almost the same as that of the Hebrew. He says that the building of Solomon's temple was commenced in the year of the world 3102, and 1440 years after the deluge. (*Antiq.*, B. viii, c. 3.) Now if we take 1440 from 3102, the remainder will be 1662, the number of years between the creation and the deluge. But

this differs only six years from the chronology of the Hebrew, which makes the time between the creation and the deluge to be 1656 years. But if Josephus wrote this latter passage, upon which no suspicion of alteration has ever fallen, the presumption is that the former statement is not from his pen, but must have been made by some of his transcribers.

In short, the chronology of Josephus, as it now stands in his history, is, in many points, inconsistent with itself. In the language of Dr. Hales, "His dates have been miserably mangled and perverted, frequently by accident, and frequently by design." The younger Spanheim, too, in his *Chronologia Sacra*, devotes a whole chapter to the errors, anachronisms, and inconsistencies of Josephus, the most of which he attributes to the mistakes of transcribers, or the hypotheses of interpreters; and concludes with representing the recovery of his genuine computations as a matter of great hazard and difficulty. But if all this be true, it is not much in favor of the Septuagint chronology that Josephus, in one of the passages above referred to, is in accordance with it.

It is urged again in favor of the Septuagint chronology that it was accepted by most of the early Christian fathers. That this statement is true there can be no doubt; and for the very good reason that most of the Christian fathers used the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and *nothing else*. They had never looked into a Hebrew Bible, and had no knowledge of the language. They were familiar with the Septuagint chronology, and quoted it, and quoted one from another. No wonder, then, that they agreed with the Septuagint.

We say that this is true of *most* of the early Christian fathers, but not of them all. Origen, the most learned biblical scholar of the third century, and Jerome of the fourth, both of whom were well acquainted with the Hebrew language, dissent from the chronology of the Septuagint. The latter agrees almost entirely with the chronology of the Hebrew, as settled by Archbishop Usher.

It is urged yet again in favor of the Septuagint chronology that the Hebrew does not afford sufficient time for connected events, and cannot be made to harmonize with the chronologies of the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the Chaldeans. This objection can lie only against the period following the deluge.

The term of 1656 years, which the Hebrew allows between the creation and the deluge, was long enough surely to account for all the events occurring between these two great epochs. And if we look at the subject considerably we shall find that the Hebrew chronology, after the deluge, furnishes ample time and opportunity for all connected events.

It has been confidently urged that the pyramids, and perhaps some other structures in Egypt, could not have been built, according to the Hebrew chronology, after the deluge. And perhaps they were not. What objection to the supposition that the pyramids were built before the deluge? There can be no doubt that Egypt was inhabited before the deluge, very densely inhabited. These huge structures may have been built in those long ages, and may have resisted, like the great mountains, the engulfing waters.*

Dr. Hales insists that it is impossible to account for the populousness of the countries in which Abraham dwelt; as Mesopotamia, Canaan, and Egypt, on supposition that he lived only from five to six hundred years after the flood. But the sacred history plainly intimates that these countries were not very thickly settled at that period. When Abraham went into Canaan the country seems to have been generally open to him. "Its population," says Dr. Stanley, "was then thinly scattered over its broken surface. Here and there a wandering shepherd may have been seen driving his sheep over the mountains. The smoke of some kind of worship, now extinct for ages, was going up from altars of rough stones."† In Egypt, too, Abraham found comparatively a small people. So late as the birth of Moses, Pharaoh assigned it as a reason for oppressing the Israelites, that they "are more and mightier than we." (Exod. i. 9.)

There is yet another event in the history of Abraham which shows that the people of the surrounding countries were, in his time, few and weak. Four kings came out of the east, among whom were the kings of Elam and Shinar, or what was afterward Persia and Chaldea, and wasted the land of Canaan and the adjacent countries, and then attacked and car-

* Berosus speaks expressly of ten generations who lived in Chaldea before the flood, the precise number given in Genesis. He enumerates, in order, the kings who reigned in those times, and mentions ten, from Alorus, the first, to Xisuthrus, in whose reign the deluge came. See Rawlinson's *Evidences*, p. 274.

† Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, p. 29.

ried captive the people of Sodom, Gomorrah, and the neighboring cities. How powerful these victorious kings were, and the kings whom they conquered, we may learn from the fact that Abraham, assisted by a few of his friends and his household servants, pursued after them, overcame them, and brought back all the goods and captives which they had carried away. (Genesis xiv.) In short, there can be no doubt that from five to six hundred years was time enough for all the people to be born and to live of whom we have any account in the days of Abraham. New England has been settled less than two hundred and fifty years, and yet its native population has almost filled the land, and has contributed not a little to fill other lands. We may see from what has taken place here among ourselves that the five hundred years and more which intervened between the deluge and the death of Abraham was time enough for the countries where he dwelt to become settled, at least to the extent in which he found them.

But we are told that the chronology of our Hebrew Bibles can never be reconciled with that of the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the Chaldeans. We have heard too much of the pretended antiquity of these nations to be greatly moved by an objection of this nature. The Chinese are an ancient people; as ancient, perhaps, as any now existing on the globe. But "that their empire dates back to a period before the flood is as extravagant," says Mr. Gutzlaff, "as any of the mythological stories of the Greeks or Hindoos." They have no reliable history before the time of Confucius, which was only 550 years before Christ. All preceding this is fabulous and uncertain.

The Bible lays the foundation of the Chaldean empire in the times of Asshur and Nimrod, from one to two hundred years after the flood. No other history traces it further back than this, or so far by several hundred years.

Peleg was born, according to our Hebrew Bibles, about one hundred years after the flood, and lived through the next 240 years. In his time, we are told, "the earth was divided." It is computed that the Chinese empire may have commenced in about the hundredth year of Peleg, and the Egyptian at nearly the same time. This would give about three hundred and twenty-seven years to the death of Abraham for the founding and establishing of these kingdoms; and we know, from what has

taken place in our own country, that a great many things may be done and great changes accomplished in three hundred and twenty-seven years.*

On the whole, the arguments which have been urged in favor of the Septuagint Chronology seem to us to have little weight, and we feel inclined to rest in the accuracy of our Hebrew Bibles.

Whether the chronology of the Hebrew was altered by the Seventy or by succeeding copyists we pretend not to say. It is well known, however, that these translators had a great desire to stand well with their heathen neighbors, and that, in some instances, they did not scruple to vary their translation, having this object in view. This is specially true of the translator of the Pentateuch. "Being anxious," says J. D. Michaelis, "to render his author agreeable not only to Jews, but to foreigners, he sometimes puts forced meanings upon words, and, with still greater audacity, absolutely corrupts the reading. For, lest the Egyptian philosophers should draw something from the sacred writers in support of their own errors, or to the discredit of the Jews, he sometimes substitutes his own sentiments for those of Moses; sometimes changes the text, and makes it conform to Egyptian history, and also alters whatever might be likely to offend foreigners by its improbability. 'Now he who has once or twice *corrected* when he should have *translated* the original text, may well be suspected, in other instances, of doing the same.'" The particular motive of the translator in changing the Hebrew chronology (if he did change it) may have been to increase the age of the world, and of his own people, and thus render them more respectable in the eyes of the Egyptians.

Those who altered the Hebrew chronology seem to have done it in accommodation to certain *hypotheses* which they had adopted, but which have no foundation in truth. One of these was, that in the antediluvian age, when men lived almost a thousand years, they were not capable of having children until they were at least one hundred and fifty years old. People at that period, it was thought, were a long while in coming to maturity, as much longer than we, in proportion, as

* On this whole subject of ancient heathen chronology, see *Aids to Faith*, pp. 290-298.

their entire age was longer than ours. They were children till they were more than a hundred years old, and as such were incapable of procreation. That such an idea prevailed extensively among the Greeks, and with some of the Christian fathers, we have the fullest proof. In accommodation to this hypothesis it was natural that the Seventy, or those who copied from them, should add a hundred years to the lives of the patriarchs previous to the birth of their firstborn sons. In most cases they *must* do this in order to make the patriarch of a suitable age to have children at all. But the hypothesis before us is a mere assumption. It is entirely without proof, or so much as probability. What reason have we to think that human nature before the flood was not essentially the same as now, and that men did not come to *be men*, and to have families, as early in life as at the present time? Following down the history of the patriarchs to a later period we find this hypothesis contradicted by facts. The children of Jacob married young, much younger than at this day would be deemed advisable. Dinah could not have been more than sixteen years old when her hand was sought by Shechem, (Gen. xxxiv, 4;) Benjamin was not more than twenty-five when he went into Egypt with his father, yet he took with him no less than ten sons. (Gen. xlv, 21.)

Another groundless assumption, having an influence in the same direction, was, that the son mentioned in the genealogy was uniformly the firstborn; but of this the Scriptures furnish no proof. In one instance they expressly contradict it. Seth, whose name is in the genealogy, was far from being the firstborn of Adam. And the supposition is in itself improbable that for fifteen successive generations the firstborn should uniformly be a son, and a son that lived to some hundreds of years.

Another Jewish hypothesis, which led to the lengthening of their chronology, was, that the Messiah could not come until the world had stood at least five thousand years. These must be five thousand years before the Messiah. During the sixth millenary his kingdom would be advancing in the earth, while the seventh would be a season of rest and peace. But, according to the Hebrew predictions and chronologies, the Messiah would come in about the four thousandth year of the world,

and this would be a thousand years too soon. Hence the chronology of the Old Testament must be lengthened. And the mode of lengthening it was that adopted by the Seventy, or their transcribers, as before explained.

Still another Jewish hypothesis, which led to the lengthening of their chronology, was, that the first six thousand years of the world would be equally divided in the days of Peleg, whose name signifies division, and, accordingly, the first three thousand years were supposed to end with the one hundred and thirtieth year of Peleg's life. The lengthening of the chronology, as we find it in the Septuagint, would not alone accomplish this purpose, and so the name of a new and fictitious patriarch, the second Cainan, is thrust in between Arphaxad and Selah, and a generation of one hundred and thirty years is given to him. This second Cainan is admitted on all hands to be a fictitious character. His name does not occur in the Hebrew, nor in our translation. (Gen. xi, 12.) And if the Seventy, or their transcribers, would thrust him in to carry out an hypothesis, the presumption is that they would not hesitate to make all other needful alterations.*

The evidence, so far as manuscripts and versions are concerned, is decidedly in favor of the Hebrew chronology. Indeed almost no important evidence of this kind can be urged in favor of the Seventy. For although the ancient Latin and Coptic versions, and not a few of the Greek fathers, agree with the Septuagint, they are none of them independent supporters and witnesses, but merely copyists. They copied from one another, and from the Septuagint, and of course might be expected to agree with it.

In favor of the Hebrew chronology we have, in the first place, the Targums of Onkelos and of Jerusalem. These are Chaldee paraphrases upon the Pentateuch, written, both of them, before the coming of Christ. The Targum of Onkelos is the most esteemed. This is so short and simple that it can hardly be suspected of corruption. The Targum of Jerusalem

* This second Cainan was entirely unknown to Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, and Theophilus of Antioch. It shows the obsequiousness with which many of the Christian fathers followed the Septuagint, that they foisted the second Cainan into the genealogy of Luke, (chap. iii, 36.) It is not at all likely that Luke ever placed it there.

is less reliable, but both agree with the chronology of our Hebrew Bible. And the same may be said of the old Syriac version, and of two Arabic versions. Jerome, in the fourth century after Christ, found in the Hebrew the same readings that we now have, and from it he corrected the Vulgate or Latin translation.

Besides the Septuagint, there were three other ancient Greek translations of the Old Testament, namely, those of Aquila, of Theodotian, and of Symmachus. Respecting the two first, we have no information touching the question before us; but the version of Symmachus is known to agree with the Hebrew.

The old Samaritan Pentateuch, as it now stands, agrees in part with the Hebrew, in part with the Septuagint, and in part it differs from both. But if we may believe the testimony of Jerome, the Samaritan chronology in his day agreed entirely with that of the Hebrew, in which case it must have been altered since.*

It may be urged, finally, against the Septuagint chronology, that it contradicts, in an important point, the narrative of Moses. It makes Methuselah to live several years after the flood. According to the Septuagint Methuselah was one hundred and sixty-seven years old when he begat Lamech, and Lamech was one hundred and eighty-eight years old when he begat Noah, and Noah was six hundred years old when the flood came. Putting these numbers together, 167, 188, 600, we have 955 years as the age of Methuselah at the time of the flood. But the Septuagint agrees with the Hebrew that the whole age of Methuselah was nine hundred and sixty-nine years. Of course he must have lived fourteen years after the flood.†

According to the Hebrew, Methuselah died in the very year of the flood, whether by old age, or by sickness, or by the deluge of waters, we are not informed. Lamech, the father of Noah, died five years earlier. None of the patriarchs, whose names are mentioned in the narrative, are represented in the Hebrew as living beyond the flood. All, with the exception of Noah and his family, had passed away.

* See Jerome's Questions on Genesis chap. v.

† There is some diversity of reading in the Septuagint in regard to the above numbers. We have given what is supposed to be the true reading.

Having expressed our preference for the Hebrew chronology above that of the Septuagint, and assigned our reasons for it, we would repeat the statement that, according to the Hebrew, the flood came in the year of the world 1656. Abraham was born three hundred and fifty-two years later, in the year of the world 2008. We have no contemporary history as yet with which to compare and rectify our dates.

Mizraim, a son of Ham, migrated into Egypt, and founded a kingdom there about two hundred years after the flood. He is supposed to be the Menes of Egyptian history. Some two hundred and fifty years later Abraham went into Egypt, and found a Pharaoh on the throne. Ample time had now been furnished for a kingdom to be established, and for the people to become somewhat numerous. Within about two hundred and sixteen years Jacob goes into Egypt to meet his lost son Joseph. He finds a rich and powerful kingdom under the rule of a monarch who goes by the common name of Pharaoh. Here the children of Israel remained about two hundred and fifteen years, making four hundred and thirty years in all since Abraham came to sojourn in the land of Canaan. (Gal. iii, 17.) And now they are led out of Egypt under the direction of Moses, and Pharaoh their persecutor is destroyed.

The question may be asked, whether we can identify the Pharaohs with whom Abraham and his descendants came in contact, with any of the Egyptian kings whose names are given in the catalogues of profane historians? My own impression is, that this cannot be done with any degree of certainty. The slightest inspection shows that these old catalogues are very unreliable. Several of them are little more than bare lists of names, commencing at no fixed, assignable period, and not agreeing with themselves or with one another. There is naught in them to contradict the history or the chronology of Moses, nor is there anything to enable one to say with confidence, "This is the king who entertained Abraham, and that the king who promoted Joseph, and that the king who was drowned in the Red Sea." Hence we find that those Christian writers, from Eusebius downward, who have undertaken to harmonize the Mosaic and Egyptian chronologies, and to identify the Pharaohs of Scripture with the kings of Manetho and others, have differed continuously and variously.

Hardly any two of them agree together. The reason is, and we repeat the declaration, there are no existing catalogues of the ancient kings of Egypt which are at all reliable. What may yet be discovered among the monuments and catacombs of that mysterious land we pretend not to say. We have no fear of any discoveries to contradict the Bible.

After the time of Moses the Israelites had no historical connection with the Egyptians for a long period. The next that we hear of them is in the time of Solomon. He married a daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and carried on a commerce with him in horses and chariots and in linen yarn. In the reign of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against him, and conquered him, and carried away all the treasures of his house. This Shishak, or She-shonk, was the first king of Manetho's twenty-second dynasty; but his name is not mentioned in the other catalogues. His tomb was opened by Champollion, who found in it a pictorial representation of his victory over the Jews. This event occurred in the year 970 before Christ, or five hundred and twenty years after the exode from Egypt.

From this time we frequently hear of the interference of the kings of Egypt, as also of the kings of Syria, Assyria, and Babylon, with the affairs of the Israelites, until at length Jerusalem is taken, the temple is destroyed, and both Israel and Judah are carried into captivity. Solomon's temple was destroyed in the year 538 before Christ, when it had stood four hundred and seventeen years.

After this we find the children of Israel subject, first, to the Babylonians, secondly, to the Medo-Persians, and thirdly, to Alexander and his successors, the kings of Syria and Egypt. From these they were delivered by the Maccabees, and lived for a time under their own native princes, subject to the watch and care of the Romans. At length they fell under the power of Herod, who was set over them by the Romans, and reigned as a tributary king. It is needless to trace their chronology through this long, dark period, as it is easily reckoned, and harmonizes perfectly with all that we know of the history of the surrounding nations.

Near the close of the reign of Herod *the great Light of the world* appeared. Our Saviour was born, according to Arch-

bishop Usher, in the year of the world 4004. But this, we know, was three or four years too late. Christ was born certainly before the death of Herod. And Herod died in the year of Rome 749-50, some three or four years earlier than the commencement of our vulgar era.

Again, according to Luke, (chap. iii, 42,) our Saviour was thirty years old in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cesar. But this would bring the birth of Christ in the year of Rome 749, as before.

Our Christian era was established by Dionysius Exiguus, a monk of Rome, about the year 532, and established too late by three or four years. The probability is (for we do not pretend to absolute certainty) that Christ was born in the year of the world 4000, and consequently that we are living in the year of our Lord 1871.

AET. V.—THE BRAHMO-SAMAJH.

I. ITS HISTORY.

THE BRAHMO-SAMAJH is a Theistic society of Hindoos, aiming at a thorough reformation of popular Hindooism. It was founded in 1828 by Rajah Ram Mohan Roy, the most interesting character that modern India presents. The Brahmos claim him as their head, and are proud of pointing to him as occupying the same position in Brahmoism that Christ, in their opinion, occupies in Christianity. A brief sketch of this remarkable man is properly connected with the history of the Brahmo-Samajh.

Ram Mohan Roy was born at Burdwan, Bengal, in the year 1774. He was a Brahmin by caste, and his father was a wealthy and respectable man—more liberal-minded than his people generally at that day. As the son grew up it became manifest that he had a mind of no common order, and this increased the desire of his father, who doted on him, to give him the very highest education obtainable. When thoroughly instructed in his own language he began the study of Persian, that he might acquire whatever of knowledge and literature that language contained. He was sent to Patna, a city distinguished as a seat of Mohammedan

learning, where he had the best teachers of the times, and an opportunity which he enthusiastically improved, of studying not only Persian but also Arabic. Although then but a lad, he became quite familiar with Persian and Arabic literature, and found attraction in the sublime doctrine of an infinite God, supreme and alone, and felt the unfavorable contrast between this and the teachings of his own sacred books. A radical bent was doubtless given to his religious career at Patna. From this place he went to Benares—a city sacred to his own people—to complete his studies in Sanscrit amid the superior advantages there afforded. Here, to his complete satisfaction, he delved in Sanscrit lore, and threaded the labyrinths of Hindoo philosophy; only, however, to become convinced that all above the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*—the most ancient books—was mere human rubbish, full of legends, fables, and stupid fiction. In the *Vedas*, however, and their theological commentaries, the *Upanishads*, he supposed that he had found solid ground. He was overjoyed to find that these ~~did not~~ contain any allusion to Ram Krishna, Ganesh, Kali, and a host of other revengeful, licentious, and filthy divinities. Thus, from the teachings of the Koran and of his own ancient sacred books, he rested in the belief of one infinite holy God. 25/

At the age of fifteen years he returned to his home, the pride of his unsuspecting father, to begin the most remarkable moral and intellectual movement of modern India. He was saddened at the blindness and deep degradation, moral and mental, that wrapped his people in a mantle of night, and determined to do something to break the spell that bound them. 26/

In his sixteenth year he issued a book boldly challenging the correctness of modern Hindooism. This at once aroused against him the indignation and persecution of bigoted Brahmins, and he was driven from his home. He wandered extensively through India, and even passed over into Thibet, busy all the while examining and comparing religious systems. After four years he returned, at the request of his father—who had followed him with an anxious and affectionate heart—but only to renew his conflict with the Brahmins. He continued these efforts for years, slowly gathering about him a few converts.

Meanwhile, having thoroughly acquired English, he also studied Greek, that he might read the New Testament in the original. He was enraptured with the teachings of Christ and his apostles, and cheerfully acknowledged that nothing in the Vedas would compare with them. He published in Bengalee, and also in English, a book called "The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Happiness." In 1828 he gave the movement he had set on foot a regular organization under the name of the *Brahm-Sabha*, or Society of the Worshipers of God. A creed was partially formed, and times of meeting, with a routine of religious service, appointed.

In 1830 Ram Mohan Roy was chosen by the king of Delhi as his ambassador in London. Here he identified himself, as it seems, with the Unitarian Christians, while still clinging to the Vedas; and here, in 1833, he died, a man as remarkable for the ingenuous liberality of his mind, as for the genius that marked his whole career. With him originated the interesting movement called Brahmoism, likely to affect very radically and extensively for good or evil the destinies of India. The real belief of Ram Mohan Roy is to this day matter of query and doubt. Perhaps an attempt to define his faith clearly would be doing more for him than he ever did for himself. For the Mohammedans, as authority accepted by himself, he quoted the Koran—so of the Holy Scriptures for Christians, and of the Vedas and Shastras for Hindoos. This he did from the belief that inspiration is a gift enjoyed, in greater or less degree, by all the race. The estimate he placed on Christ is still a question with Christians and educated Hindoos who were acquainted with his opinions. He seems at least to have given him the supreme place among men. "A day may soon arrive," said he, "when every one will regard the precepts of Jesus as the sole guide to peace and happiness." After his death it was claimed by some persons in England that Ram Mohan Roy was a Unitarian or Socinian. This called forth a letter from Bishop Luscombe of Paris, in which he mentions a long conversation had with him regarding his belief in the Trinity. "He assured me," wrote the bishop, "that the first chapter according to St. John was sufficient to convince him of the divinity of Jesus Christ; and 'even the first verse,' said he, 'says enough on the subject to confirm me in my adhesion to

this doctrine;' whereupon he quoted to me the passage in Greek." Nevertheless, from statements made at other times, the faith of this singular man is left in doubt.

In 1828, before Ram Mohan Roy went to England, he organized, as we have seen, what was called the Brahm-Sabha or Brahmo-Samajh. On his death in 1833 a few able men from among his followers took up the work of reformation, chief among whom was Baboo Debendronath Tagore, a man of ability, and who then really became the head of the movement about which a considerable number of converts rallied. A few years after the death of Ram Mohan Roy the reformation he had set on foot declined in interest; but in 1839 the impulse he had given the native mind burst forth anew. The old Brahm-Sabha was supplemented by another organization under the name of the *Tattwabodhini Sabha*, a kind of missionary society for the Brahm-Sabha. From this time the society assumed an aggressive attitude, and efforts were made to propagate more largely the new faith. A press was set to work, schools were opened, and branch societies established in several places. In 1845 an event occurred which affected radically the character of the Brahmo-Samajh.

Ram Mohan Roy had taught that the Vedas are a reliable revelation. But from some cause a suspicion was excited in the mind of Debendronath Tagore that all was not right even in the Vedas, and accordingly he sent four pundits (religious teachers) to Benares to ascertain carefully what were the real teachings of the Vedas. For two years they closely studied their meaning, then returned to Calcutta with the result of an investigation fatal to Vedantism. It was with no little surprise that the Brahmists found that they had been resting on a defective foundation. They found that the Vedas contain untenable dogmas, and from that time they swung off more completely to natural religion—acknowledging as their only certain guide pure intuition and the light of nature—and claiming to rest in Theism. A book called the Brahm-Dharma, (the theistic religion,) being compilations from the Hindoo scriptures, was published in 1851. It contains the creed of the Brahmists, as they were called at that time, and is their "confession of faith." It has not, however, been satisfactory to all, but has been the cause of some stormy dissensions among

Brahmists. More recently this Indian Rationalism or Theism has been called *Brahmoism* and its adherents *Brahmos*. The society is always now called the *Brahmo-Samajh*—"Samajh" meaning a society or assembly.

II. PRESENT CONDITION OF THE BRAHMO-SAMAJH.

What, then, are the Brahmos? what are they doing? and what are their prospects?

As has been seen in the development so far of the movement called Brahmoism, there have been two marked stages. When first the Hindoo mind, through this peculiar revelation, began to awake from the night of depraved ignorance and blighting superstition that had brooded on it like a mighty incubus for twenty-five centuries, as if loth to leave entirely the vast temple of error so long its home, it rested for a time in Vedantism. Down through the fungous growth of ages stratum after stratum was cut away, until below all, in the clear and apparently divine utterances of the ancient Vedas, a secure and infallible foundation was supposed to be found. The Vedas became for a time a certain guide. *Vedantism* is a vague idealism. It is claimed that it is monotheistic, and that it does not teach idolatry and the system of caste. But restless intellect, so recently unchained, would exert itself, and even the Vedas were scrutinized so closely and frankly that Vedantism went to the wall. Thus cut loose from the authority of a written revelation, it was thought that no more reliable guide could be found than the voice of intuition and the teachings of natural religion. Theism, or the second stage of this development, has been reached. The Brahmos profess now to rest in pure Theism, and to affiliate closely with the Francis Newman school of England, and the Theodore Parker school of America. Their creed—if Theism may be said to have a creed—embraces the following cardinal points:

1. There exists one eternal supreme God, infinite in all his attributes, good and merciful.
2. He is spirit, hence without form.
3. From his worship and service alone can happiness be enjoyed here and hereafter.
4. The worship of God consists in acts of devotion and praise, and his service in the practice of virtue.

5. The soul is liable to transmigration until thoroughly purified, and prepared for the region of eternal blessedness.

6. The only true revelation is pure intuition, by which the thoughtful and virtuously disposed can discover truth and the path of duty.

These items include the main points in the belief of the Brahmos; but of course there must be a multiplicity of opinions on minor points of faith, at least among men who profess to be guided by the vague and shadowy light of intuition and nature. Besides these general enunciations of the principles of their belief, the Samajh has a covenant to which its members subscribe, containing a list of rules for daily life and conduct. These are concerned chiefly with the worship of God, the general practice of virtue, and efforts for the propagation of Brahmoism. The main points on which the Samajh insists are a renunciation of idolatry and polytheism; the abolition of caste, polygamy, and infant marriages; female education, the introduction of women into society, and purity of morals. The difficulty of rapid and abrupt changes is recognized, and considerable latitude given to questions of expediency. But just on this point, in 1865, a pretty complete schism occurred in the Samajh. A progressive party became of the opinion that certain rules of practice and forms of worship were not consistent with the doctrines of Brahmoism, and demanded a change. Others, whose intuitions, somehow, were not so clear, and for whom nature shed a different light, wished to conserve the old position and forms. The contention has not yet become so sharp as to part the Samajh entirely asunder, but has resulted in two parties in it, giving us a pointed comment on the clear light of nature and intuition, and another proof of the wisdom of God in granting us a *written* and authoritative revelation. One of these parties is called the conservative, and the other the progressive party, and they are making efforts at reconstruction.

A word on the form of worship adopted by the Brahmos may not be devoid of interest. In their writings they speak of themselves as a Church, using much of the ecclesiastical phraseology current among Christians. Each society gives its place of worship, or the assembly itself, a name, after the manner of Christian Churches. There is in Calcutta an

assembly of females called the *Brahmica Samajh*. Females now, in some instances, worship in the same assembly with men, but have secluded seats. The Brahmos meet in halls or chapels appointed for the purpose, and remain seated during service, which is considerably modeled after the forms of Christian worship. It consists of recitative prayers and praises from a printed ritual or book of worship. Sermons are read and extempore prayers offered. The service is interspersed with singing and chanting, accompanied by an instrument, generally a harmonium. After all intuition and the light of nature have done for the Brahmos, their awkward aping of Christians is badly concealed. The entire number of Brahmos at present is not known, but they number many thousands, and are of all grades, from the fast youth who laughs at the stupidity of his old Hindoo father, and eats beef* in the Calcutta saloons, to the timid Nicodemuses, who come to their teachers by night. There are now fifty-four Samajhes or assemblies throughout India; of these fifty are in Bengal, which at present contains the native brain of India. The Calcutta Samajh, the oldest, has held its thirty-sixth anniversary. More than half the samajhes have been established in the last ten years, and show that the society has more than doubled in less than one third of the time it has existed. It has eight theological schools for regular instruction in Brahmoism, and is also taking up the work of purely secular education. The Calcutta College was founded by the leading members of the samajh in Calcutta. The society has conducted in its interests for the inculcation of Theism seven what they would call religious papers. Besides these are four more strictly secular and political papers, conducted by Brahmo editors, and containing a decided Brahmic element. Two of them, "*The Indian Mirror*" and "*National Paper*," are published in English. The society's press in Calcutta has issued a number of books and tracts, both in Bengalee and English. Brahmoism has no system of ordination by which a ministry is regularly set apart for the propagation of this faith, and the edification of believers. Yet there are now at least eight men actively engaged as missionaries, giving their whole time to the work of spreading this Indian Theism among their countrymen.

* The cow is sacred to the Hindoos, and to eat its flesh is a mortal sin.

Such, then, is the state of Brahmoism at the present time, with its fifty-four samajhes or congregations scattered from Lahore in the Punjaub to Madras in the south—with its press and literature and periodicals, with its schools and missionaries.

And there is purpose and unity in this movement. In October, 1864, a Representative Council was organized in Calcutta, with a view to uniting all the samajhes in unity of plan, action, and sympathy. This meets annually, and is intended to have a representative from each congregation. The aggressive character of the movement is seen in efforts to send forth and maintain a regular staff of missionaries, among whom there is a show of piety and disinterested devotion to a definite aim. The following is from the leader of the Calcutta Samajh. Speaking of their missionaries, he says:

Humble, and not trusting in their own, but in the Lord's strength, these itinerant missionaries have gone about in different directions, preaching the saving truths of Brahmo-Dharmo, and through divine mercy success has invariably crowned their labors. May the Brahma-Samajh live to fulfill her grand mission, and may her missionaries, by precept and example, by self-denial and martyr heroism, prove instrumental, under God's guidance, in delivering India from the curse of idolatry, and blessing its teeming population with light and life.

Missionaries, in their expectation of the final triumph of Christianity in India, can hardly excell the calm confidence of these men. Another Brahma writes thus:

When we find society is progressing, and men in general are marching onward, and the Brahma missionaries are working with their head and heart, doubt not a time is fast approaching when Brahma religion—the pure heaven-born religion—will be the prevailing religion of the world, and establish union and brotherhood among all the nations of the earth, severing asunder the shackles of superstition and sectarianism.

A few extracts from the literature and journalism of the men who propose to convert India and the world may serve to illustrate the stage of their English and thinking. Nations, it is said, have, just as individuals, a mental growth from childhood to manhood. Almost all India is yet in mere mental childhood. In Bengal the mental life of the nation has reached the state of boyhood, with here and there an

individual case of something like real manhood. Generally, however, we have even here only the boyish sophomoric aping of big thoughts and philosophic ideas that often amusingly mark the transition from boyhood to manhood. Note the not altogether unsuccessful grasping after the philosophical in the following:

Idolatry is not the peculiar institution of our country. In one shape or other it has existed in every country. It is, so to say, the logical condition of the development of man's religious consciousness. Knowledge begins in the concrete—the abstract is only reached after a process of generalization. The infant hardly knows man from the beast; and when it begins to know this distinction it is from the features of its parents, of its nurse, or of those near it. As it grows up it recognizes its species distinctly, and advancing still further in life, it forms at last the abstract conception of the soul.

Some one, aspiring to give to the world something after the style of Solomon, runs on thus in a little aphoristic book called "True Faith:"

Faith is singular, and moves in its own ways, which are past finding out.

Geography cannot find its latitude and longitude; nor can arithmetic compute its age, nor history portray its true life.

Philosophy hideth its face in shame, after vainly exerting to ascertain its why and wherefore.

Verily its actions are unintelligible to the world, and its life is a deep mystery.

Another benevolent-minded Brahmo throws open his charitable heart for native Christians thus:

It is, however, not to be denied, that a few are really charmed with the beauty of Christianity, and convinced of its truth. They take its shelter because they fondly hope it can meet their spiritual demands and give them salvation. The outward surroundings of Christianity are so vivid, captivating, and popular, so full of imagination and gossip, and the indwelling truths glitter now and then with such a benignant ray, that some who have recently learned to disbelieve in Hindooism are delighted to discover such an easy staircase to the kingdom of heaven. To such great pity is due.

A zealous Brahmo gave vent to the pious prophetic rapture of his soul thus:

It is evident, from revolutionary movements and every-day occurrences, that the last day of existing religions is at hand. It is our highest gratification to prognosticate, that after such a long time we will be in a position to take leave of all false religions, and hail Brahmoism as the harbinger of the world's real greatness and happiness. . . . The bishops and all other divines may join together to make common cause to put it down; still Brahmoism will not be checked. It will daily, and I hope hourly, grow amid all the terrors, perils, and trials; and the Brahmo missionaries will always be forward in inculcating the saving truths of pure Theism, and propounding schemes for its rapid advancement, and will ever persevere in doing so till the last drop of blood runs through their veins. .

There is something to be admired in the tone of the sturdy purpose that finds expression here, and we may well hope that it is something more than awkward verbal aping, and that it may yet find vent in a nobler cause.*

One more example is given, which is evidently the utterance of a full-grown man. It is from perhaps the best Brahmo mind in India.

The cultivated tastes of educated natives cannot long submit to the hundred and one pernicious institutions of the country, which are at once a scandal to their reason, a shame to their nationality, and a bar to all material and spiritual advancement. And hence it is, that for some time past there has been a ceaseless and irresistible struggle to shake off all abuses and corruptions which are offensive to the educated mind. The abolition of suttee and infanticide, the establishment of the Brahmo-Samajh, the legalization of widow remarriage, the founding of girls' schools, and the present agitation against the multitudinous evils of polygamy, are among the most significant and cheering results of that struggle, and constitute the splendid trophies which western education has directly or indirectly achieved in this country within the short space of thirty-six years. Well may we exult amid this bright scene of reform and progress, and sincerely grateful must we feel to those earnest-minded natives and Europeans who, by wise counsel and philanthropic action, have brought it about: and all honor to those who are laboring to advance still further the cause of India's civilization, and realize that great future that awaits her.

These samples may serve in some degree to show the state and culture of the native mind engaged in this reform. An interesting query is,

* The natives of India are sadly wanting in independent manly vigor generally.

III. WHAT LIGHT DOES IT THROW ON THE PROBLEM OF THE EVANGELIZATION OF INDIA?

We can here enter into but a meager consideration of a few ideas suggested by observation, and the nature of the Brahmo-Samajh reform.

1. Strictly speaking this whole movement is one of *reason* rather than of religion. In other words, it is more the result of intellect revived and aroused to its true and normal action, so that of necessity and by compulsion it divests itself of old forms of belief, and of a dwarfed and unnatural existence. It is this, rather than the result of moral and religious impulses in some way put in motion. The philosophy of the movement may be thus briefly stated: The diffusion of knowledge rendered untenable old incorrect ideas and forms of belief. The spread of true mental light of necessity dispelled the error and darkness of minds with which it came in contact. The medicinal or curative influence of true knowledge and science restored mind to its normal laws of reason and belief, and rendered it incapable of a diseased form of action, and of retaining its erroneous form of belief. Let the mental vision be beclouded with the films of ignorance, the growth of centuries—let the mental retina be paralyzed by a thousand superstitions and errors—and men will be seen as trees walking. But cut away the films from that vision, and let mellow floods of healing light play upon that retina, and men will be seen as men, and trees as trees. It is not easy to trace the process by which the Hindoo mind was overgrown by such a superstratum of error; how it suffered itself to become paralyzed by such astonishing and puerile credulity. The fact we have before us, and with evidence that formerly a remarkable degree of scientific and religious light was enjoyed. In the Brahmo-Samajh we have an example of what true knowledge can do in restoring helpless intellect. The scales gradually fell from the mind of an intelligent youth as he moved about, inspired with a thirst for knowledge wherever it might be found. It is not difficult for us to discover how he received the first awakening impulse. Right manfully did he strive to impart the light he had received to those around him, and when he fell the torch was taken up and borne forward by a

worthy successor. He still lives, though stricken in years, to behold with admiration the movement of a new life in the corpse of Hindooism. Still, it is rather an intellectual movement, lacking the ardor and moral enthusiasm that naturally belongs to a religious reformation. Indeed, as a so-called Theistic movement it could hardly be otherwise. There is nothing in mere Theism to inspire religious fervor, such as fills the true Christian's heart. Nothing short of a definite written revelation can inspire this. For enfeebled, alienated humanity, nothing short of the incarnation—God manifest in the flesh—can do this. All else falls short of bridging the vast gulf that separates fallen man from God, and leaves him to wander in the cold mental realms of speculation and conjecture.

2. But thus much we have learned from Brahmoism: Hindooism cannot stand before the spread of correct knowledge. To the friends of education in India this is an encouraging and significant fact. Where a correct knowledge of history and natural science is acquired with logical habits of thought, popular Hindooism becomes perfectly untenable. Education has proved itself a Hercules that could burst the gyves which bound the Indian Prometheus to his gloomy rock, where for long weary centuries the vulture of idolatry and superstition had devoured his vitals. Looking simply at what enlightened education has done in Bengal, we may know that, strongly entrenched as Hindooism has proved itself to be, even in education we have the key to its position. Already its flank has been successfully turned. To use another figure, we know where Samson may be afflicted, and we should improve the lesson well.

There need be no fear here of elevating human agencies and influences in importance over the divine power of the Gospel. God works, and manifests his wonderful providence and power *through* just such agencies. True Christianity marvelously spread throughout the Roman empire apparently without the aid of an educational establishment. Yet it should be borne in mind that schools of philosophy had done for Ephesus, and Corinth, and Rome, just what enlightened education is doing for India. Hindooism would in the end yield to enlightenment, even if Christianity did not enter the arena. If the Church

and missionaries do their duty, it will enter when and wherever in God's providence a breach is made.

The Brahmo reform, as a result of enlightened education, throws some light on the probable fate of Mohammedanism. Generally Mohammedanism is considered as promising less success to Evangelism than Hindooism. There is something so subtle in its error, something so plausible in its pretensions, such an admixture and semblance of truth in the system, that it seems much less vulnerable than Hindooism. No wonder that one long and well acquainted with Mohammedanism suggests its probable origin in diabolic inspiration. Still a careful consideration of the question leads to the conclusion that the proud, specious dogmatism of Islam must yield to the logic of enlightened education. Its unscientific assertions—or rather, its opposition to science, and its illogical teachings—render it, equally with Hindooism, untenable to enlightened minds. It is impossible that a system the error of which, after all, is so palpable and transparent, will not fall when a good degree of enlightenment is brought to bear upon it. How can well-informed minds cling to a professed revelation which contains statements and ideas directly opposed to correct science; which statements are not simply an adaptation of figure and language to the apparent condition of things or language that may be harmonized with the developments of science, but flat dogmatic contradiction of the known condition of things?

According to the Koran, the sun sets in a spring of black mud, which Dhulkarnain (supposed to be Alexander) saw, who also visited the place where the sun rises. The earth is represented as flat, and the mountains are placed upon it as great weights to keep it steady. Meteors are fiery stones hurled at stealthy devils climbing up the sky to pry into the secrets of heaven. An enlightened mind can hardly fail to detect the work of an ignorant impostor in all this. Again, the Koran with the whole system of Islam is absurdly illogical. It demands belief without evidence, and stamps a spirit of inquiry or investigation as base infidelity. It holds, with Christianity, that religion has been given to the world in dispensations rising by each addition in spirituality and higher, clearer morality; and yet, while claiming that in this way Christianity has been superseded by Mohammedanism, just as Judaism was super-

seded by Christianity, fails to see that Mohammedanism would roll the race back into a materiality and ritualism far below Christianity, and but little above Judaism, while its morality sadly lacks the purity and elevation of either. Further, it speaks of one revelation or communication abrogating another, and yet fails to see the absurdity of an earlier communication abrogating a later, as is the predicament in some instances in the Koran, as taught and understood. We are also presented with the inconsistency of one *moral principle* abrogating another: of the Koran admitting on the one hand the divine authority of the New Testament, and yet on the other hand controverting its history and doctrines; and that, too, when the uncorrupted preservation of the New Testament is unchallenged! These palpable fallacies, together with the "earthly, sensual, and devilish" spirit of Islamism, must in the end betray its real origin to enlightened minds. If nothing else, at least a rational reform must set in against it, as is now the case against Hindooism. The fact may be noted that India is the only place where anything like a true liberal education is being brought to bear generally upon Mohammedans. In Turkey, and all the states dependent on the Sublime Porte, the dogmas of Islamism, with the Koran and commentaries on it, form the chief part of the system of education. As it seems impossible for intellect, duly enlightened and drilled into a logical appreciation of historical and general evidence, to rest in anything so grossly illogical as Mohammedanism, we may yet see the first great effective breach made in it on the soil of India. Already enough is seen in the movement called Brahmoism to show the importance of education in connection with Evangelism. Nothing narrow should characterize views and efforts in the great work of overthrowing Hindooism and Islamism. The work is destructive as well as constructive. We must tear down before we can build. Among simple aboriginal tribes in some parts of India missionaries entered upon what seemed to be unoccupied ground, and built up, with wonderful success, because they were spared much heavy labor in the way of demolition. Hindooism and Mohammedanism are grim old castles, strong in the accumulated fortifications of centuries, and they must be breached and beaten down before the work of construction can successfully

x Mohammedans deride the uncorrupted preservation of the N.T.

take place. If in God's providence education shows itself to be an effective battery in demolishing the strongholds of the enemy, it should be well manned and worked with vigor.

4. Regarding the future of the Brahmo-Samajh, it is difficult to divine much. It is not to be a harmonious movement, for already it is sadly divided on prudential questions. From its very boasted intuitional foundation it must be subject to frequent and continual schisms. However, the real danger that this reform has for Evangelism is not to be despised. Silently but surely the sapping and mining processes of education are causing popular Hindooism to tumble; but it would be a sad victory, if, as the process goes on in the country, a Rationalism or Deism worse than ever cursed Germany and France, should follow in its wake. This just now seems to be the danger. Brahmoism is Rationalism and Deism struggling with Christianity over the ruins of Hindooism for the mastery of India. Ultimate victory cannot be doubtful for Christianity, but the delay of triumph for some generations would be a result much to be deplored. By anticipating danger here, effort should be made to avert what it threatens. Every Indian missionary must familiarize himself with the deistic, rationalistic, and neo-religious questions of the day which apparently are to repeat themselves in India. The deadliest battles of Indian Evangelism may be fought on this ground. Education and enlightenment are inevitable. So much the more reason why missionaries should educate vigorously, imparting education with gospel truth in it, and striving to institute a counter revolution—one that will, by the Divine blessing, thoroughly checkmate this Indian Theism, and give to the people the blessing of sanctified enlightenment and Christianity.

ART. VI.—MIGNE'S ROMAN CATHOLIC PUBLISHING HOUSE.

Bibliothèque Universelle du Clergé et des Laïques Instruits. (Circular.) Paris, Migne, 1867.

JACQUES-PAUL MIGNE was born on the 25th of October, 1800, at St. Flour, a village of the department of Cantal, in the heart of France. He was early destined for the Church; and after pursuing his theological studies at the seminary of Orleans, he was ordained priest in 1824. In 1825 he was appointed *curé* of Puiseaux, in the department of Loiret. He had some difficulties in this charge with his diocesan, Bishop Beauregard; but what the trouble was is not stated in the authority* from which we derive this brief biographical introduction. The fruit of it was, however, that he resigned his post. In 1833 he came to Paris and determined to devote himself to literature, but always in the service of the Roman Catholic Church. His first essay was the establishment of a newspaper, *l'Univers Religieux*, which afterward became the *Univers*, so celebrated as the organ of Ultramontanism, under the able but unscrupulous editorship of that warlike son of the Church, Mons. Venillot. While in the Abbé Migne's hands, the journal sought to avoid the strife of parties which raged so bitterly within the bosom of the Apostolical (!) Church of France, and to be simply and purely a "Catholic" journal, (*catholique avant tout.*) The Abbé's industry was indefatigable; and his devotion to his task is shown by the number of articles signed L. M. in the old volumes of the journal. But newspaper work was not the Abbé's mission. He found his place and proper work in 1836, when he opened a printing office, on a small scale, in a suburb of Paris, (Petit-Montrouge.) Thirty years have passed, and now the "Book Concern" is one of the most vast, and at the same time one of the most complete establishments for the manufacture of books in the world. One of the recent catalogues concludes with the following notice:

If you desire to see in operation all the arts and processes of typography, you are invited to visit the *Catholic Workshops* at Petit-Montrouge. Type-founding, stereotyping, printing, binding,

* Vapereau, Dictionnaire des Contemporains, pp. 1215.

are all going on at once within the walls of the establishment, and on a scale which is not rivaled by the Imperial Printing-office. In all the processes where it can be utilized, steam-power is employed. Our capacity of production is so enormous that we can turn out *two thousand* quarto volumes every twenty-four hours. A monk of the middle ages could not copy in three years the number of pages printed in this establishment in one minute.

That this account is not exaggerated will appear from the statements given in the course of this article.

The latest catalogue issued by the Abbé Migne is now before us; and it affords, within itself, not only material for forming a judgment of the great task achieved by the industry and skill of a single man, and that man a priest, in a sphere of business quite foreign, one would think, to his education and habits, but also an insight into the means by which this great success has been accomplished. The very external appearance of the catalogue is a characteristic indication. It is a dingy pamphlet of forty pages, printed on coarse paper, with small type, crowding a vast amount of matter into a small space. A single number of Longman's or Rivington's monthly announcements would cost more money, we should judge, to get up. It opens with the Abbé's "Profession of Faith," prefaced with the *naïve* remark that those who think they are better Romanists than the author may "make a better confession if they can; the pages of *La Vérité* (a journal issued by the Abbé) are open to receive it!" This "profession" begins with a declaration that all the publications of the *Ateliers Catholiques* are submitted to the judgment of the Holy See. "I approve what the Pope approves; I condemn what he condemns: I recognize in the Holy See my master, my teacher, and my judge: my feeble learning is eclipsed by its science, as the light of a torch is outshone by the sun at noonday. . . . The Church of Rome is my mother; her name is ever on my lips; I rejoice in her triumphs and grieve with her griefs. She is the queen of all Churches; how much more the sovereign of a poor priest!" The Church of Rome is for the Abbé, the head of the mystical body of Catholicism; the center of unity; the source of all law; the interpreter of the truth; the rule of justice and the oracle of morals; the arbiter of controversies; the infallible guardian of the sacred deposit of the faith. All these heads are enlarged upon in the "Profession," which concludes with the following apostrophe:

O Holy Roman Catholic Church! so essential art thou to mankind, that if God had not founded thee, man must have organized thee, for the government and guidance of the intellectual and moral world. My printing-office, I trust, will reproduce, before my labors are ended, all the oracles to which thou hast given birth from the Ascension of thy Divine Spouse until the present time; and thus present, for the wonder of men, the inexhaustible riches of thy wisdom, prudence, and holiness. May my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I ever publish a word to thy injury. . . . Thou knowest my heart and my purposes, that they are pure. I am nothing, and can do nothing of myself; wisdom, science, strength, must come to me from on high. I have no other aims than the glory of God, of the Virgin, and of thee, O Holy Church; and the good of the clergy and the people, without honor or earthly recompense for myself.

O Holy Roman Catholic Church! my labors began through thee; I continue them, and hope to end them through thee; that I may rest in thee; aided by the grace of God and sustained by the Immaculate Mother of the Saviour. May the clergy second my endeavors, so that I may courageously bring to an end my great publications, namely, the Sacred Books; the Fathers; the Councils; the Bullarium; the Theology; the Apologetics; the Sacred Eloquence; the Church History; the Canon Law; the Liturgies, etc., and then the world will see me, in spite of persecutions, jealousies, and rash judgments, at last reproduce, *at a low price*, all the great works of Catholicism without exception.

Our readers will notice how simply and naturally the Abbé glides into a telling "advertisement," at the very close of his devotional apostrophe to Mother Church and the Virgin Mary. It is clear that he was a born merchant. He would have made his fortune in any trade by sheer dint of advertising skill.

The most important part of the document, in a literary point of view, is a special prospectus of sixteen pages, addressed to the Roman Catholic clergy and to "the educated laity," in which an account is given, somewhat in detail, of the chief publications of the Concern. A catalogue of two hundred compact pages is promised, to contain minute accounts of all the publications, with a thousand Episcopal letters of commendation. But from the statements in the small catalogue before us, as well as from personal inspection of many of Abbé Migne's publications, we proceed to give our readers some account of them.

First, and most important, is the "Complete Course of the Greek and Latin Fathers." This immense collection includes all the Fathers, Doctors, and Ecclesiastical writers, from the

apostolical age down to the time of Innocent III., (A. D. 1216,) for the Latin writers, and for the Greeks, down to the time of the Council of Florence, (A. D. 1439.) The Abbé's prospectus asserts that in this collection the best editions have been followed, and that great pains have been taken in collating the various editions, and in many cases also in comparing them with the manuscripts.

Ample indexes are given, both alphabetical and analytical, amounting in all to no less than two hundred and forty tables; "so arranged that not only the scholar, but the ordinary reader, can discern what he wants among the treasures of patristic erudition." The good Abbé, with his usual skill in advertising, further announces that "this edition is preferable to any other, in view of its paper and printing, its convenience of form, the integrity of the texts, the great cheapness of the work, and the vast advantage of having in one collection, completely indexed and chronologically arranged, the works of *all* the Church writers, including the smallest fragments, heretofore scattered through multitudinous books and manuscripts, very difficult, and in some cases impossible, to obtain."

The Latin Fathers fill, with the indexes, two hundred and twenty-two volumes, imperial octavo. The Greek writers (with Latin versions) take up one hundred and sixty-seven volumes of the same size. The Latin version of the Greek Fathers is also published separately in eighty-four volumes. The greatest marvel, perhaps, of this vast undertaking, is the cheapness of the books. The Latin Fathers are sold, (when the whole set is taken,) in paper covers, at five francs (one dollar in gold) the volume; the Greek Fathers, with the Latin version, at eight francs, (\$1 60 gold;) the Latin versions, alone, at five francs again. If the volumes are bound in half sheep, an additional charge of thirty-five cents a volume is made. When it is remembered that the books are all in imperial octavo, (called in French usage *quarto*,) their extraordinary cheapness will be at once recognized.

For purposes of reference, there can be no question that this is the most convenient series of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical writers ever published. Complaints are made of many of the volumes, (and justly,) that sufficient care has not been taken with the editing, in spite of Abbé Migne's advertise-

ment; and it is further charged, that, in some cases, the old literary policy of the Church of Rome, of modifying, omitting, and even garbling, for polemical purposes, has been followed by Migne. For the study of special authors there are, certainly, editions to be had more accurate and trustworthy than Migne's; and no student who desires to be thorough in critical study would ever be satisfied without comparison of various editions. But with all drawbacks, the fact remains that the *Cursus Completus Patrologiæ* is an indispensable necessity to every large theological library. How many copies of the whole series have been sold in this country we do not know. There is a copy in the library of Dickinson College; and one has been ordered for the Drew Theological Seminary.

To the list of the Fathers in this catalogue, the Abbé Migne appends a characteristic bit of exhortation to his clerical brethren. The Fathers and Doctors, he tells them, constitute the chain of Catholic tradition, and the most important treasure of the Church next to the Scriptures; all the schools of theology commend the study of the Fathers; all writers on theology recommend them; and, finally, no professor or preacher can be eminent who does not place his lectures or sermons upon the solid foundation of the Fathers, as well as of the Scriptures. After this preamble, which every good priest will of course admit, the skillful advertising exhortation comes in:

Is there *any* complete edition of the Fathers but ours? Is there *any*, giving all the authors, complete as to substance, uniform in size and form, correct as to text, cheap as to price? Can any priest now say, honestly, that the Fathers are hard to obtain or dear to buy? Is it not clear, then, that the priest who does not possess them is lacking, either in Christian intelligence, or in practical faith?

The following touch is inimitable:

Even to have this complete edition of the Fathers ranged on your library shelves will exalt you in the eyes of all who see it there. They will admire you for preferring to invest your savings in this way, rather than in the public funds or in other investments, to many of which the clergy devote themselves with a zeal ill-becoming their sacred profession, subjecting themselves to all the agitations of mind which attend the possession of property whose value is perpetually fluctuating.

The next great work in the list is a "Complete Course of Commentaries on the Scriptures," in Latin, comprised in

twenty-eight imperial octavo volumes, and sold at twenty-eight dollars, in paper covers. The Vulgate is given, with a French translation facing it; and all the greatest commentators of the Roman Church are included in the series. We have not personally examined this series, and cannot therefore speak critically of it; but Migne asserts that no commentary is inserted in it which did not unite in its favor the voices of the chief bishops and theologians of the Roman Church in Europe, all of whom were consulted as to its publication. A biography of each author is given. Parallel with the series of commentaries is the "Complete Course of Theology," also in twenty-eight volumes, of the same size and price, and edited in the same way. The authors who, by common consent, have treated any special branch of theology with pre-eminent skill, are chosen in that branch; so that the collection, while it constitutes an entire and complete system of Roman theology, gives what are supposed to be the best treatises extant on each subdivision. The Abbé's genius for advertising finds play again with reference to these two courses. "Whoever possesses them may say to himself, No matter what commentaries or treatises of theology are published, I care not, for I have the very best on my shelves; and I may devote myself wholly to the study of them, without need, on the one hand, of buying other authors at random, and without risk, on the other, of remaining ignorant on any important point in Scripture or theology. How many times, before the publication of these two series, would the poor pastor be heard to say, 'O, if I could gather together the great writers on the Scriptures and on theology, with what zeal and fruit would I devote myself to study them.' Well, then, what was once a dream is now a reality. You need no longer say, 'The good books are beyond the deep, or on the heights, who shall fetch them?' but rather say, 'They are nigh unto you.' If you do not get them, the fault is your own. *O sacerdotes, attendite.*"

The fourth series of publications consists of the "Démonstrations Evangéliques," a collection of writers on the Evidences of Christianity. We deem it worth while to give, in a note, the whole title of this vast repository of Apologies for Christianity.* It will be seen that the list contains not merely the

* *Démonstrations Evangéliques.* De Tertullien, Origène, Eusèbe, S. Augustin, Montaigne, Bacon, Grotius, Descartes, Richelieu, Arnauld, de Choiseul-du-Plessis-

names of the ancient apologists, and those of the Roman Catholic Church, but also those of all the principal Protestant writers on the evidences of Christianity. The word *intégralement* in the title of the work is not strictly correct, as those passages in Protestant writers which impugn the Roman Church or its doctrines, are generally omitted. The collection, nevertheless, is a very valuable one for the history of Apologetics. The series is preceded by an introductory volume, by the Abbé Chassay, entitled "*Préparation Évangélique*," and aiming, like its celebrated namesake, the *Præparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius, to defend Christianity by citing the judgments of its opponents. Chassay is one of the best-informed of the coterie of writers whom Migne has drawn about him; and this volume attests his ample reading, and also the shrewdness of his understanding. Its citations are confined almost wholly to writers of the present age, theological and scientific; and they are all made to contribute, in some way, to the general design of the book. These remarks will hardly apply to the concluding volume of the series, by the same author, in which he furnishes what he calls the "*Infidel Catechism*," in which he cites the modern Rationalists and unbelievers, from Rousseau to Strauss and Feuerbach, as involuntary witnesses for Christianity. One of its heads is "*Protestantism*," which is thus made a branch of Rationalism; and is satisfactorily demolished, according to M. Chassay, by his citations from its own writers.

Praslin, Pascal, Péllisson, Nicole, Boyle, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Locke, Lami, Burnet, Malebranche, Lesley, Leibnitz, La Bruyère, Fénelon, Huet, Clarke, Duguet, Stanhope, Bayle, Leclerc, du Pin, Jacquelot, Tillotson, de Haller, Sherlock, Le Moine, Pope, Leland, Racine, Massillon, Ditton, Derham, d'Aguesseau, de Polignac, Saurin, Buffier, Warburton, Tournemine, Bentley, Littleton, Fabricius, Addison, de Bernis, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Para du Phanjas, Stanislas 1^{er}, Turgot, Stattler, West, Beauzée, Bergier, Gerdil, Thomas, Bonnet, de Crillon, Euler, Delamarre, Caraccioli, Jennings, Duhamel, S. Liguori, Butler, Bullet, Vauvenargues, Guénard, Blair, de Pompignan, Deluc, Porteus, Gérard, Diessbach, Jacques, Lamourette, Laharpe, Le Coz, Duvoisin, de la Luzerne, Schmitt, Poynter, Moore, Silvio Pellico, Lingard, Brunati, Manzoni, Perrone, Paley, Dorléans, Campien, Pérennès, Wiseman, Buckland, Marcel de Serres, Keith, Chalmers, Dupin aîné, Grégoire XVI., Cattet, Milner, Sabatier, Morris, Bolgeni, Chassay, Lombroso et Consoni; contenant les apologies de 117 auteurs, répandues dans 180 volumes, traduites pour la plupart des diverses langues dans lesquelles elles avaient été écrites, reproduites intégralement, non par extraits.

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XIX.—27

We have still to note a literary enterprise, so vast that an ordinary publishing house would find its hands full in accomplishing it if it attempted nothing else; namely, the three series of Theological Encyclopedias published by the Abbé Migne. His first plan embraced a series of dictionaries, to be completed in fifty-two volumes, entitled "*Encyclopédie Théologique*," (The Theological Encyclopedia.) The titles of the several dictionaries (topically arranged) are as follows:

Écriture sainte; Philologie sacrée; Liturgie; Droit canon; Hérésies, Schismes, Livres jansénistes, Propositions et Livres condamnés; Conciles; Cérémonies et rites; Cas de conscience; Ordres religieux (*hommes et femmes*;) diverses Religions; Géographie sacrée et ecclésiastique; Théologie dogmatique, canonique, liturgique, disciplinaire et polémique; Théologie morale, ascétique et mystique; Jurisprudence civile-ecclésiastique; Passions, vertus et vices; Hagiographie; Pèlerinages religieux; Astronomie, physique et météorologie religieuses; Iconographie chrétienne; Chimie et minéralogie religieuses; Diplomatie chrétienne; Sciences occultes; Géologie et chronologie chrétiennes.

The volumes are uniform in size and shape with those of the Patristical series, (imperial 8vo.,) and the set is sold at the marvelously low price of 312 francs, or \$1 50 per volume, in paper.

Finding the first encyclopedia to be a success, the Abbé undertook a second, called the "*Nouvelle Encyclopédie Théologique*," in fifty-three volumes of the same form. It contains:

Dictionnaires de Biographie chrétienne et antichrétienne; des Persécutions; d'Eloquence chrétienne; de Littérature *id.*; de Botanique *id.*; de Statistique *id.*; d'Anecdotes *id.*; d'Archéologie *id.*; d'Héraldique *id.*; de Zoologie; de Médecine pratique; des Croisades; des Erreurs sociales; de Patrologie; des Prophéties et des miracles; des Décrets des Congrégations romaines; des Indulgences; d'Agri-silvi-viti-horticulture; de Musique chrétienne; d'Épigraphie *id.*; de Numismatique *id.*; des Conversions au catholicisme; d'Éducation; des Inventions et découvertes; d'Ethnographie; des Apologistes involontaires; des Manuscrits; d'Anthropologie; des Mystères; des Merveilles; d'Ascétisme; de Paléographie, de Cryptographie, de Dactylogie, d'Hiéroglyphie, de Sténographie et de Télégraphie; de Paléontologie; de l'Art de vérifier les dates; des Confréries; et d'Apologétique chrétienne.

The price is the same as that of the first series, \$1 50 a volume.

Not content with these two enormous collections, a third was projected, (now completed with the exception of three volumes,) to take in topics not fully covered by the two first series. It is entitled "*Troisième et dernière Encyclopédie Théologique,*" and contains,

Dictionnaires de Philosophie catholique ; d'Antiphilosophisme ; du Parallèle des diverses doctrines religieuses et philosophiques avec la doctrine catholique ; du Protestantisme ; des Objections populaires contre le catholicisme ; de Critique chrétienne ; de Scholastique ; de Philologie du moyen âge ; de Physiologie ; de Tradition patristique et conciliaire ; de la Chaire chrétienne ; d'Histoire ecclésiastique ; des Missions catholiques ; des Antiquités chrétiennes et découvertes modernes ; des Bienfaits du christianisme ; d'Esthétique chrétienne ; de Discipline ecclésiastique ; d'Erudition ecclésiastique ; des Papes et cardinaux célèbres ; de Bibliographie catholique ; des Musées religieux et profanes ; des Abbayes et monastères célèbres ; de Ciselure, gravure et ornementation chrétienne ; de Légendes chrétiennes ; de Cantiques chrétiens ; d'Economie chrétienne et charitable ; des Sciences politiques et sociales ; de Législation comparée ; de la Sagesse populaire ; des Erreurs et superstitions populaires ; des Livres apocryphes ; de Leçons, en vers, de littérature chrétienne ; de Leçons, en prose, de Littérature chrétienne ; de Mythologie universelle ; et de Technologie universelle.

This series is in sixty volumes, at \$1 50 per volume.

The literary merit of the different dictionaries varies greatly. We do not pretend to have examined them all ; but we have made use of a sufficient number of them to say, in general terms, that they constitute the least valuable and reliable portion of the Abbé Migne's numerous publications. We give a single specimen from the "*Dictionnaire du Protestantisme.*" Under the article "*Methodism,*" after stating, with some clearness, the rupture between Wesley and the Moravians, the "*Dictionnaire*" proceeds as follows :

A more cruel trial for Wesley was his dispute with his friend Whitefield on predestination. Wesley held that God had irrevocably fixed, from all eternity, the lot of every individual man, in virtue of his own irresistible will—the pure fanaticism of Calvin. Whitefield, on the other hand, held to the freedom of the human will, which, nevertheless, he pushed to its extreme of Pelagian exaggeration. A large part of the Methodist body agreed with Whitefield ; and sought by prayers, reasonings, and even by menaces to recover Wesley from what Whitefield called "the most monstrous error ever engendered in the human mind." All was vain ;

and from 1740 onward the Wesleyans and the Whitefieldians stood apart, as had, in the sixteenth century, the Gomarists and the Arminians. Whitefield's final argument was, that the Holy Spirit had personally testified to him the falsity of the doctrine of predestination; but Wesley claimed an equal degree of inspiration for his own desperate system. "Never," said he, "have I read a line of the writings of Calvin; my doctrine is from Christ and his apostles; the Lord has put it into my heart and into my mouth."

If Roman Catholic priests get all their notions of Protestant history and theology in this topsy-turvy fashion, it is no wonder that they remain ignorant and superstitious, even when surrounded by all the massive volumes published by the Abbé Migne, which, according to his advertisement cited above, have the merit of exalting the priests' knowledge in the eyes of his parishioners, if they do not furnish his mind with accurate knowledge.

It is only fair to say, that on purely Romanist usages, for example, liturgy, ritual, etc., the dictionaries of this series furnish a large amount of valuable, and, no doubt, reliable information.

The department of ecclesiastical history furnishes matter for another extensive work, the "*Cours Complet d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*," in twenty-five volumes, imperial octavo, at \$1 50 a volume. This work was intrusted to the hands of the Baron Henrion, a French lawyer of the old régime, an advocate of absolutism both in politics and religion, and author of many historical works, especially "*The History of France*," (4 vols., 8vo., 1837-1841; the "*History of the Religious Orders*," (1835, 2 vols.) and the "*History of Roman Catholic Missions*," (1844-47, 2 vols., 8vo.) His "*Church History*" is a voluminous compilation, in the purely Papal spirit, beginning with the Creation, and going down to the time of Pope Pius IX. Twenty-one volumes have appeared; four yet remain to be published.

The department of Homiletics and Pulpit Eloquence gives room for a still more voluminous series, entitled, "*Collection Intégrale et Universelle des Orateurs Chrétiens*." The method of the series is chronological, with the aim of presenting, in actual specimens, the history of preaching in France for four centuries. It is comprised in one hundred volumes, imperial

octavo, at five francs, (\$1 00) a volume. Two hundred and fifty preachers are represented in the series; and of this number, two hundred, including the great masters, such as Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, etc., are reprinted entire.

Mariolatry is not neglected in the "Catholic Workshops." The "*Summa Aurea*," in eleven volumes, (imp. 8vo.,) contains a collection of nearly all that Rome has gathered about the Virgin Mary: history, worship, miracles, and all. The third part of the work consists of a collection of treatises on Mariology, or the doctrine of Mary; on the Immaculate Conception, etc. "This work," says the Abbé, in his accompanying advertisement, "is not only the most complete, the most extensive, the most pathetic, and the most authoritative of all that have yet appeared in honor of the Holy Virgin, but it may be said to include all the good literature of the subject. Not, indeed, the books and pamphlets on the topic, unfortunately so numerous, and many of them so worthless, that spring up on all sides like the plagues in Egypt; but all the solid work of councils, popes, fathers, doctors, and great ecclesiastical writers." The good Abbé, it appears, knows how to lay on the whip, on occasion, as well as to use the spur.

Among the minor publications of this great "workshop," (minor, as compared with Migne's larger issues, but large in themselves, for ordinary publishing houses,) is the "*Promta Bibliotheca*" of Lucius Ferraris, in eight volumes imperial octavo. This work is an encyclopedia of the canon law, ritual, liturgies, etc., of the Roman Catholic Church, and has passed through many editions. We have used, for some time, the Madrid edition of 1795, ten volumes bound in five, folio, which was considered the best before this issue of Migne's, and has always commanded a high price. Brunet, in the new edition of his *Manuel du Libraire*, gives its price at 130 francs, or \$26, (gold.) The new edition is sold at 60 francs. It is founded on the Benedictine edition of 1844, and professes to be carefully revised and enlarged, with the addition of copious indexes. The book is thoroughly ultramontane, and has never, therefore, until recently, found favor among the French clergy. Even now, the Abbé tells us, the other nations of Europe order it by dozens, while France takes it only by single copies.

The works of Thomas Aquinas, including the *Summa Theologiæ*, and the *Summa Philosophiæ*, appear in five volumes. Perrone's *Prælectiones Theologiæ*, which, in the ordinary editions, occupies nine volumes, and sells at from nine to fifteen dollars, is republished by Migne in two of his portly volumes at two dollars and a half. The substance of Suarez is given in two volumes; and a summary of the Canon Law also in two. Gesenius's *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, with his *Grammar*, revised, furnishes matter for an enormous volume, which is sold at five dollars. A *Lexicon Manuale Mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis* makes another ponderous volume at three dollars. The works of Saint Theresa, chiefly on Christian Perfection, in the Roman Catholic sense of the term, are issued in four volumes; those of Francis of Sales in six; the devotional works of Boudon in three; the entire works of Bossuet in eleven; those of De La Tour in seven; Baudrand, De Pressy, Le François, De La Chetardie, De Pompignan, two each. Pallavicini's *Council of Trent* is given in three volumes; the complete works of de Bonald in three; Cardinal Luzerne in six; Thiebault in eight; Bergier in eight; the Port Royalists, on the "Perpetuity of the Faith," in four; the Vulgate Bible in two; and the "Ritual" in two; while numerous minor authors appear in a single volume each. It is to be remembered that *all* the volumes are in imperial octavo; the Abbé Migne publishes books in this one form only.

Besides the publication of books, the "Catholic Workshops" are engaged in the manufacture of all the various articles used in Romanist worship. If you want a cathedral organ, the Abbé Migne has one for you at six thousand dollars; if you need a harmonium, he will give you a choice of thirteen sizes, from thirty dollars up to three hundred, in various styles of finish. He has always on hand a quantity of pictures and statues, for the ornamentation of Romanist churches.

The statements given above suffice, as we said in the beginning of this article, to show that the Abbé Migne does not exaggerate, in his published announcement, the extent of his operations or the success of his great enterprise. The means of that success have also, to some extent, transpired in our extracts from his various advertisements; but they deserve to be looked into a little more closely. The first element of success,

in any enterprise, is the personal character of the man that undertakes it. The Abbé clearly possesses rare gifts as a business man. All his programmes and circulars show dexterity and adroitness to a remarkable degree. Our extracts have already illustrated this point; a single additional illustration, and a very characteristic one, may be allowed. It appears that the business was originally started on very small capital; and, in the growth of its operations, there have been periods when loans were needed. The Abbé tells us, in his latest circular, that, whenever he has found himself in need of money for some "great operation," he has naturally had recourse to his brethren in the ministry, and to certain "intelligent and wealthy laymen." He now makes a new appeal, in order to achieve the completion of all his great series of publications:

It may be asked, Why hasten this work of completion? The answer is easy. We wish, in the first place, to put all our readers, clerical and lay, in possession of the complete Courses of Theological Science which we have promised them; and, in the second place, we desire to *rest*, after more than thirty years of continuous labor, in which nothing but the herculean strength of our physical constitution would have enabled us to endure so immense and persistent a strain of our intellectual and bodily faculties. We could go on slowly in our work without a loan. But who knows that our strength will last? who can support perpetual toil without rest or change? and what a public calamity would it be should our task be unhappily left unfinished at last?

The simplicity of this personal confidence is calculated to enlist the sympathy of all who read it. Even the Abbé's obvious appreciation of his own deserts, so naively set forth, tends to impress one with a sense of his honesty of purpose. But he goes on:

We are sure that, now as heretofore, our appeal will not be in vain. Our friends know the nature of our task; and many of them, animated by the sacred fire, are accustomed to large views of duty. But we can add, also, that there is no better "savings bank" for loans than this establishment; under no circumstances—not even a total destruction of our stock by fire—can investments made with us be imperiled. We are fully insured, in twenty different companies. Again, were it necessary for us to close our business, our sheet-stock, sold as waste paper to the grocers, and our stereotype plates, sold as old metal, would more than pay all our debts. Our stereotype plates alone have cost more than a million of dol-

lars; and our volumes in stock are more in number than those of the Imperial library. Add to all this property our book-debts, our presses, tools of all sorts, our Journal, our library, and our immense buildings with the ground on which they stand, all free from mortgage, and you may readily conclude that the man who lends his money to us may sleep with both eyes shut, and have no troubled dreams about the safety of his investment. His security, in a word, is a property worth three million and a half of francs, after all debts are paid; a property which has grown up out of religion, and every penny of which will go back to the service of religion.

We call that a masterpiece. What country curé, with a few hundred dollars saved, would care to invest in the profane public funds, when he has thus a chance to serve the interests of the Church, and at the same time knows that his money is as safe as it would be in the Bank of France?

But the Abbé presents a further claim upon the sympathy and support of his co-religionists. It is his purpose, he tells us, when his life-task is ended, to hand over his establishment to a "Religious Congregation," for the propagation of the faith. His successors, in order to keep up with the demand for solid theological literature, will have nothing to do but select from the stereotype plates those which are needed, and print off the sheets. All the fearful preliminary labor of writing, selecting, editing, and composition, has been done to their hands. After this interjection of higher thoughts and aims, he comes back again skillfully to his money matters:

A thing unheard of in commerce, during our thirty years of business, never, from any accident even, has our paper been protested; our signature remains a virgin one. Moreover, see the engagements we take upon ourselves with those who wish to deposit their money with us. 1. We pay all expenses of correspondence and transmission of money. 2. We allow an interest of five per cent. in specie, or of seven per cent. in books taken at choice from our entire stock. For a loan of five years' date, we will deliver in books the entire interest for the whole period, as soon as the money is in our hands.

Perhaps nothing has contributed more to the success of Migne's "Book Concern" than the plan which he has pursued from the beginning, of publishing only books of solid and permanent character, such as are considered necessary for every Roman Catholic library. In his whole list there is hardly a single volume of merely ephemeral interest. More-

over, his greatest work, the *Cursus Patrologiæ*, will find its way into all the great Protestant libraries, as well as Roman Catholic; and the same remark will hold with regard to several others of his weighty books. As a point of detail, but yet one of real importance as an element of success, the uniform size of all the publications of the house is also to be noticed. This has doubtless proved to be a great economy in the working of the establishment; all the presses, forms, etc., in fact all the implements of manufacture both for printing and binding, are of the same size, and can be used for any of the purposes of the workshop without the trouble of discrimination or selection. Moreover, this uniformity of size is a great recommendation to purchasers. Lovers of books are apt to become fastidious as to the appearance of their shelves; and, besides, it is both economical and convenient to have one's shelves of the same width throughout a compartment or division of a library. All workers among books, moreover, desire to have volumes of the same class together on the shelves, and it often happens that, in a careful arrangement, one must put a quarto or an octavo beside a duodecimo.* This has been, undoubtedly, one element of the success of such series as Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclopædia* and Bohn's *Libraries* in general literature, and of Clark's *Library* in theological science.

The last point we shall notice among the causes of the Abbé Migne's success, is the care which he seems to have taken to steer clear of the party strifes within his own Church, and to unite, as far as possible, all parties in support of his undertakings. The internal feuds of the Romanists probably give rise to far more bitterness of feeling than the differences between the various denominations of Protestant Christians. Family quarrels are always the worst. So far as we can judge, the abbé has car-

* This is a great difficulty with librarians. There is a pleasant article in Blackwood, (May, 1867,) entitled, "*How to make a Catalogue of Books*," in which the writer, speaking of a topical arrangement of books on the shelves, remarks, "There are tall books and short books in close proximity. Of the statutes at large, one edition is five inches high, another is two feet. Some of the volumes of Deixon's great work on Egypt are about the height of a shortish man; and there is an abridgment of it in octodecimo, which of course must stand by its side. The effect is odd, and certainly not pleasing. It reminds one of the distresses of a martinet commander who could not get his band to "dress." Such uneasiness could we suppose that a man who likes to see his books "range on the shelves" would experience on witnessing this effort at topical arrangement."

ried through, in his capacity of publisher, the motto with which he set out in his early career as newspaper editor, *Catholique, avant tout*, "Catholic, not partisan."

The reader who has followed us thus far can hardly have failed to note the points of likeness between the history of the great publishing house of Migne and that of the Methodist Book Concern in New York, of which an able and thorough historical sketch (by Dr. Porter) appeared in our last number. Migne's success, like that of the Book Concern, shows amply the fallacy of the hasty but often repeated judgment, that clerical control is necessarily ineffective in great enterprises of this character. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find, in the history of the publishing trade, instances of great and permanent growth from small beginnings, to rival the Methodist Book Concern and Migne's Publishing House.

One leaf, we think, our agents might wisely take out of Migne's book, namely, the plan of publishing one series after another of solid theological literature. We do not note this in any spirit of complaint as to what has been done heretofore. The publications of the establishment have generally been timely, and adapted to the current wants of the ministry and laity of the Church. But the last ten years have wrought a great change. Our ministers are largely supplying their libraries with books, both English and American, not of our own production, and not in sympathy with our ecclesiastical and religious position. Our laymen, also, have, with increase of wealth, imbibed a taste for fine books and fine editions. To a certain extent it will always be the case that cultivated men must and will travel beyond any possible lists of books that our own publishing house may put forth. But it is possible, and if we are not mistaken the time has arrived when it will be found easy and safe to enlarge our field. Indeed, an excellent beginning has been already made in the series of commentaries so admirably opened by Dr. Whedon. But why could not our Book Concern issue a series similar to Clark's Library, say four volumes octavo a year, at a subscription price of eight or nine dollars per annum? It may begin with reprints of the soundest Arminian divines of England—say the life and works of John Goodwin; and after a while, a good system might be devised for the preparation of a series of manuals on the

whole field of theological learning, such as our theological schools greatly need, and which might also be adapted to our disciplinary course of study.

It may be necessary for the General Conference to express an opinion on such a development of our publishing enterprise before the agents would feel themselves authorized to undertake it. We throw out the suggestion in time for full consideration before the next session of that body.

AET. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE RITUALISTIC CONTROVERSY.—OFFICIAL DECLARATIONS OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY AND YORK, AND OF THE IRISH BISHOPS—PROCEEDINGS OF THE RITUALISTIC AND ANTI-RITUALISTIC ASSOCIATIONS.—The bishops of the Church of England have at length deemed it necessary to take some official action on the ritualistic question, which keeps up a much greater agitation than the Colenso case has ever done. On the thirteenth of February the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury unanimously passed the following resolutions, (the archbishop and thirteen bishops being present:)

Having taken into consideration the report made to this House by the Lower House concerning certain ritual observances, we have concluded that, having regard to the dangers, first, of favoring errors deliberately rejected by the Church of England, and fostering a tendency to desert her communion; second, of offending even in things indifferent devout worshippers in our Churches who have been long used to other modes of service, and thus of estranging many of the faithful laity; third, of unnecessarily departing from uniformity; fourth, of increasing the difficulties which prevent the return of separatists to our communion—we convey to the Lower House our unanimous decision that, having respect to the considerations here recorded, and to the rubric concerning the service of the Church in our Book of Common Prayer, our judgment is that no alterations from long-sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our Churches until the

sanction of the bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto.

When the judgment of the bishops was sent down to the Lower House it gave rise to a good deal of discussion, and a number of amendments were offered, all of which, however, were finally withdrawn in favor of an amendment moved by Dr. Leighton, that the House should concur in the judgment of the Upper House, leaving the reasons given by the bishops out of the question. This was carried, and conveyed by the prolocutor to the Upper House, as the opinion of the Lower. A few days after the meeting of the convocation of Canterbury, (Feb. 19,) the Archbishop of Canterbury, in reply to a deputation from the National Club, had expressed himself very strongly against the tendency of the Ritualists, saying that he found it impossible to evade the conviction that among those who were joining in the present movement for the restoration of eucharistic vestments, the use of the incense, and candles lighted in the day-time, the offering of the holy sacrament as a propitiatory sacrifice, and the elevation of the consecrated elements for the worship of the people, there were many who were resolved, if possible, to obliterate in the formularies and worship of the Church of England every trace of the Reformation.

In the Convocation of the province of York, on the 20th of March, the following resolutions were proposed by Canon Hey, and seconded by the Dean of Ripon:

Whereas certain vestments and ritual observances have recently been intro-

duced into the services of the Church of England, this House desires to place on record its deliberate opinion that these innovations are to be deprecated, as tending to favor errors rejected by that Church, and as being repugnant to the feelings of a large number both of the laity and clergy. And this House is further of opinion that it is desirable that the minister, in public prayer and the administration of the sacraments and other rites of the Church, should continue to use the surplice, academical hood, or tippet for non-graduate, and the scarf or stole; these having received the sanction of long-continued usage.

The resolution was adopted in the Lower House by twenty-three to seven votes, and unanimously concurred in by the Upper House.

The archbishops and bishops of Ireland, in reply to an address from a committee of laymen on the subject of ritualistic innovations, unanimously signed a reply in which they say, "That it is the right and duty of the laity of the Church to take a lively interest in the maintenance of the sound doctrine and the pure worship which were restored to it by the Reformation, and that the exertions of the bishops in defense of these inestimable blessings, if they were at any time endangered, would mainly depend for success, under God, upon the cordial co-operation of their lay as well as clerical brethren. They were able to say, each for his diocese, that within their knowledge no cases of excessive ritual existed in this part of the United Church; but if it should be otherwise, they were fully prepared to use all their authority and influence to discourage and resist all changes in the manner of performing divine service which are contrary to the spirit of the Reformed Church of England."

The Ritualists have not been intimidated by these Episcopal declarations. The English Church Union, the principal society of the Ritualists, in their first meeting after the passage of the resolutions in the Convocation of Canterbury, adopted a report on the present aspect of the question, which set forth the circumstances under which the resolutions were passed, and entered very fully into the arguments connected with them. It concluded by recommending the adoption of a series of resolutions, the last of which stated that the Union fully trusted that a cautious adherence to lawful ritual, and a careful avoidance

of needless causes for unjust imputations, will in time lead the English mind to perceive that the fears which the Upper House had expressed had no real foundation. The Rev. Dr. Pusey, in moving the adoption of the report, said he had no doubt the first two resolutions expressed the distinct meaning of the bishops. The real objective presence we learned in the Catechism, and drank it in in our devotions, and it was utterly inconceivable that the bishops could speak of it as rejected by the Church of England. So long as the Prayer-Book remains as it is, so long will all these things remain in the Church of England. The Nonconformists see this very well, and if it were pointed out to them our people would see it too. They say the Prayer of Consecration itself would be a mockery unless it were meant to express the Real Presence, and therefore nothing will content those who make this attack but giving up the Prayer-Book. And thus there are but two ways of meeting them—either to resist them, or to split the Church of England to pieces.

The greatest efforts for counteracting the schemes of the Ritualists are made by the "Church Association," an association organized for this sole object in 1866. It recently held its second annual meeting, when the following resolutions were adopted:

That this meeting deprecates in the strongest terms the unchecked continuance by clergymen in the Church of England of practices and teaching utterly at variance with the principles of the Reformation, and, as it believes, contrary to the law of the Church as at present existing; and pledges itself to continue all constitutional means whereby the grievances complained of may be remedied, and the efforts to obtain redress on the part of those who are driven in consequence from their parish churches may be encouraged and supported. That this meeting, fully convinced that by united action alone the widespread conspiracy to subvert the principles of the Protestant Reformed Church can be resisted, strongly recommends the Church Association to all the loyal members of that Church as an institution, in its principles and organization, whereby such united action may be effectively carried out, and therefore as deserving their cordial support.

The association has also issued a formal address to the Church of England, in which they state that the

council of the association have had for some time under their consideration four plans designed to arrest the progress of Ritualism.

1. To ascertain and vindicate the law of the Church by a prosecution for practices considered illegal. 2. To strengthen the law of the Church by an enactment directed against the most obnoxious practices of Ritualism. 3. To enlarge the power of the bishops, and give them a discretionary jurisdiction to regulate the performance of public worship. 4. To refer the whole questions to a Royal Commission. On the first point, they state that they have been assisting parties in certain cases. On the second point, they think no measure would be likely to find favor with the House of Commons. On the third point, they remark that the result might either be such a struggle of opinions within the Commission that no report would be possible, or else a compromise satisfactory to none. The council, therefore, urge those who are now moving for a commission to pause, at least for a short time, till the success of direct legislation has been put to the test. Under the fourth head they allude to Lord Shaftesbury's bill, declaring the use of Romanizing vestments illegal, and the Council recommends the bill to the support of the country.

CONVOCAION OF A GENERAL ANGLICAN COUNCIL, CONSISTING OF ENGLISH, SCOTCH, IRISH, AMERICAN, COLONIAL, AND MISSIONARY BISHOPS.—One of the most important events in the modern, and perhaps in the whole history of the Anglican Churches, is the invitation issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury to all the bishops of the Established Church of England and Ireland, the bishops of the English colonies, the missionary bishops in connection with the Church of England, the bishops of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, to meet in general council, on September 14, at his residence, Lambeth. The occasion for this important movement is fully set forth in the letter of invitation, which we give in full as a most important contribution to the ecclesiastical history of our age.

LAMBETH PALACE, Feb. 22, 1867.

"RT. REV. AND DEAR BROTHER: I request your presence at a meeting of the

bishops in visible communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, purposed, God willing, to be holden at Lambeth, under my presidency, on the 24th of September next and the three following days.

"The circumstances under which I have resolved to issue the present invitations are these: The Metropolitan and bishops of Canada last year addressed to the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury the expression of their desire that I should be moved to invite the bishops of our Indian and Colonial Episcopate to meet myself and the home bishops for brotherly communion and conference.

"The consequence of that appeal has been, that both Houses of the Convocation of my province have addressed to me their dutiful request that I would invite the attendance, not only of our own home and colonial bishops, but of all who are avowedly in communion with our Church. The same request was unanimously preferred to me at a numerous gathering of English, Irish, and colonial archbishops and bishops recently assembled at Lambeth, at which—I rejoice to record it—we had the counsel and concurrence of the eminent bishop of the Church in the United States of America, the Bishop of Illinois.

Moved by these requests, and by the expressed concurrence therein of other members both of the home and colonial Episcopate who could not be present at our meeting, I have now resolved—not, I humbly trust, without the guidance of God the Holy Ghost—to grant this grave request, and call together the meeting thus earnestly desired. I greatly hope that you may be able to attend it, and to aid us with your presence and brotherly counsel thereat.

I propose that, at our assembling, we should first solemnly seek the blessing of Almighty God on our gathering, by uniting together in the highest acts of the Church's worship. After this brotherly consultations will follow. In these we may consider, together, many practical questions, the settlement of which would tend to the advancement of the Kingdom of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, and to the maintenance of greater union in our missionary work, and to increased intercommunion among ourselves.

Such a meeting would not be competent to make declarations, or lay down definitions, on points of doctrine. But united worship and common counsels would greatly tend to maintain practically the unity of the faith; while they would bind us in straiter bonds of peace and brotherly charity.

I shall gladly receive from you a list

of any subjects you may wish to suggest to me for consideration and discussion. Should you be unable to attend, and desire to commission any brother bishop to speak for you, I shall welcome him as your representative in our united deliberations.

But I must once more express my earnest hope that on this solemn occasion I may have the great advantage of your personal presence.

And now I commend this proposed meeting to your fervent prayers; and, humbly beseeching the blessing of Almighty God on yourself and your diocese, I subscribe myself your faithful brother in the Lord, C. T. CANTUAR.

CHINA.

STATISTICS OF THE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES AND THE MISSIONARY STATIONS. —Full statistical information on the present condition of the Protestant missions in China is given in the "Directory of Protestant Missions in China, June 15, 1866," issued from the American Methodist Episcopal mission press at Foochow, China. The following are the statistics of the stations:

	Mission- aries.	Help- ers.	Rec'd in 1866.	Mem- bers.
Canton	24	28	34	228
Hongkong	25	22	104	558
Swatow	8	13	30	152
Amoy	16	41	94	892
Takao	1	1
Foochow	22	24	42	224
Ningpo	32	42	141	656
Shanghai	19	7	22	242
Hankow	6	5	4	40
Kinkiang	1
Chefoo	7	4	5	17
Tungchow	9	4	5	41
Tientsin	11	5	3	29
Peking	21	10	24	63
Kalgan	2

The following are the statistics of the various societies:

	Members.
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Canton, Foochow, Tientsin, Peking, Kalgan) ..	83
"Bapt. Miss. Union (Swatow, Ningpo) ..	235
"Methodist Episc. Church, South (Shanghai) ..	20
"Meth. Episc. Mission (Foochow) ..	148
"Protestant Episc. Mission (Shanghai, Peking) ..	69
"Presbyterian Mission (Peking, Tungchow, Canton, Ningpo, Shanghai, Chefoo) ..	307
"Reformed Dutch Mission (Amoy) ..	347
"Southern Bapt. Convention (Canton, Shanghai, Tungchow) ..	143

American United Presbyt. Mission (Canton)
British and Foreign Bible Society (Shanghai)
Berlin Ladies' Societies (Hongkong)
Chinese Evangelization Society (English) Ningpo ..	59
Chinese Evangel. Society of Berlin (Hongkong) ..	143
Church Mission Society (Hongkong, Foochow, Ningpo, Peking) ..	214
Engl. Baptist Mission (Chefoo) ..	14
Engl. Meth. New Conn. (Tientsin) ..	15
Evangel. Miss. Soc. of Basel (Hongkong) ..	200
Engl. Presbyt. Mission, (Swatow, Amoy, Takao, Peking) ..	278
Engl. United Meth. Free Churches (Ningpo)
English Wesleyan Mission (Canton, Kinkiang, Hankow) ..	46
Hongkong Diocesan Female School (Hongkong)
London Miss. Society (Canton, Hongkong, Amoy, Shanghai, Hankow, Tientsin, Peking) ..	672
National Bible Society of Scotland (Peking)
Rhenish Miss. Society (Hongkong) ..	100
Society for Promoting Female Education in the East (Hongkong)
United Presbyt. Church of Scotland (Ningpo) ..	49
Independent

Altogether there were in China in 1866, 97 ordained missionaries, 14 lay missionaries, 93 missionary ladies, (whole number of missionaries 204,) 206 native helpers. In 1865, 282 members were received into the Christian Churches, and the total number of native members was 3,142. The largest number of Christians are at Amoy, (892,) after which follow, Ningpo, (656,) Hongkong, (558,) Shanghai, (242,) Canton, (228,) Foochow, (224.) Among the societies the London Missionary has the largest congregations, together with 672 members. The prospects of Christianity in China have greatly improved in consequence of the treaties which, in 1858, were concluded with the great Christian nations, and, after the attempt of the Chinese to evade the execution, had led to a several years' war, were ratified in 1861. These treaties not only establish full religious toleration, but they expressly state that the principles and practices of Christianity tend to benefit mankind. Thus Article 13 of the French treaty says: "The Christian religion, having for its essential object to lead men to virtue, the members of all Christian bodies,

(communions,) shall enjoy full security for their persons, their property, and the free exercise of their religious worship; and entire protection shall be given to missionaries who peacefully enter the country furnished with passports such as are described in article eight. No obstacles shall be interposed by the Chinese authorities to the recognized right of any person in China to embrace Christianity, if he pleases, and to obey its requirements without being subject on that account to any penalty. Whatever has been heretofore written, proclaimed, or published in China, by order of government, against the Christian faith, is wholly abrogated and nullified in all the provinces of the empire." Since then, the preaching of Christianity has not been again seriously interfered with. Missionaries have traveled as far as four hundred miles into the interior and publicly proclaimed the Gospel to the assembled crowds of people, freely distributing Christian books without the least opposition from the authorities. The capital (Peking) itself has been occupied as a station by several missionary societies, and England, the United States, France, Spain, and Russia have ambassadors there who watch over the interests of the several Christian Churches. During the last months very encouraging information has been received from several of the missionary stations. One of the most remarkable awakenings that is known in the whole history of Protestantism of China took place in 1866 in connection with the out-stations of the Tientsin mission of the English New Connection Methodists, especially at Lou-Leing, where in September forty-five persons were admitted to baptism. The converts added to the

mission churches of the London society in Shanghai and the province of which it forms the capital, numbered during the year 1866 one hundred and eighty-nine. Together with the number of native members, the number of Christian institutions steadily increases. Thus the London Missionary Society has established in the populous city of Hankow a hospital, with which will be connected a hall where the Gospel will be preached daily.

An event of considerable importance for the Protestant missions of China is the establishment of a monthly religious paper in the English language (the "Missionary Recorder") by the missionaries of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Foochow.

The English Presbyterian Mission at Takao, upon the island of Formosa, which was established in 1865, and which in the above list still appears without Church members, is becoming one of great importance. The missionary is aided by three converted Chinese. Four male converts have lately been united in Church fellowship, one of whom belongs to the Petaou city, where it is hoped he may be the means of carrying the Gospel. The island of Formosa, in Chinese called Taioan, is two hundred and sixty miles long, and at least seventy-five miles wide. Takao, the seat of the English Presbyterian mission, is situated on the western side of the island, and has from two thousand to three thousand inhabitants, but south and north there are wide tracts of country. Eight miles distant is the district of the city of Pe-taou, comprising a population of from ten thousand to twelve thousand persons.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.*

AMONG the many excellent cyclopedic works which Protestant Germany has produced, the "Cyclopedia of Instruction and Education,"[†] by Dr. Schmidt, of

* Most of the books noticed below can be found on hand, and all can be obtained, at the bookstore of Louis W. Schmidt, 24 Barclay-street, New York.

Stuttgart, deserves an honorable mention: (*Encyclopedie des gesammten Erziehungs und Unterrichtswezens*. Gotha, 1859 *sq.*) The editor in chief is assisted by Dr. Palmer, one of the ablest German writers of educational affairs, and many other authors, clergymen, and teachers. The work embraces the whole province of pedagogics and all its auxiliary sciences, inclusive of the history of

pedagogics, and very complete statistical information. It abounds in able biographies of men distinguished as teachers, or writers, or educators, and gives very interesting and full accounts of the educational systems and institutions of America, England, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Portugal, Austria, and Prussia, and every other country. To all teachers, and all friends of education, this work can be cordially recommended.

A new contribution to apologetic literature is given in Kritzler's *Humanität und Christenthum. (Civilization and Christianity. Vol. I. Wiesbaden, 1866.)* The author compares the fundamental views of biblical Christianity with the objections made by modern Materialism and Pantheism, and in a popular and brilliant style undertakes the defense of the former. The first volume contains fourteen chapters, which, among other subjects, treat of the relation of civilization to Christianity, on views of modern civilization, on Christian civilization, on grace, miracles, and power, on mystery and revelation, on the God-man, on the incarnation of the God-man. The work is highly recommended in the theological papers of Germany.

The year-book of the Gustavus Adolphus Association, (*Jahrbuch des Gustav-Adolf-Vereins*, Elberfeld,) of which the third volume was published in 1866, contains much interesting information on the progress of Protestantism, and in particular, on the operations of the Gustavus Adolphus Association. The volume for 1866 contains elaborate articles on the Lutheran Church in Russia, on the Gospel in Constantinople, and on the ecclesiastical condition of Sweden.

Dr. Baltzer (Prof. of Rom. Cath. Theology at the University of Breslau) has begun the publication of an elaborate work on the harmony between the biblical account of creation and the results of modern science. (*Die Biblische Schöpfungsgeschichte*, etc. Leipzig, 1867. First volume.)

Information on the Lutheran congregations of Bohemia, Moravia, and the Slavic districts of Hungary is given in Dr. Wangemann's "Travels through a part of Bohemia, Moravia, and the country of the Slovacks," (*Reise*, etc. Berlin, 1866.) Bohemia has nineteen

Lutheran congregations; Moravia thirteen. The latter are divided into two seniorats, Brunn, (four congregations,) and Zauchtelen, (nine congregations,) together twenty thousand souls. The Slavic Lutherans in Hungary have recently attracted some attention by their conflicts with the Magyars, charging the national party of Hungary with a desire to deprive them of their Slavic language as well as of their (High Church) Lutheran character. The author is at the head of a High Church Lutheran Society, which supports feeble Lutheran congregations abroad.

From the ninth annual report of the Berlin Association for Evangelical Missions in China, (*Neuenter Bericht des Berliner Hauptvereins*, Berlin, 1864), we learn that this special Chinese missionary society supports one missionary in China, that during the last thirty months ninety persons were baptized, and that seventy pagan schools, with one thousand one hundred and sixty-nine scholars, are under the superintendence of the missionary.

The first volume of an extensive monograph on Patriarch Photius of Constantinople has been published by Professor Hergenröther, of Würzburg, (*Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel. Sein Leben seine Schriften und das griechische Schisma. Vol. I. Ratisbon, 1867.*) The author is Professor of Roman Catholic Theology at the University of Würzburg, and, from his former works on Church history, it may be expected that the subject will be treated from the standpoint of a strict and uncompromising Roman Catholic. At the same time the thorough acquaintance of the author with the history of the Greek Church, and with the history of Photius in particular, warrants an expectation that the work, however partial, will deserve the attention of Protestant theologians. Hergenröther has previously published a heretofore inedited work of Photius. (*Liber de Spiritus S. Mystagogia*. Ratisbon, 1858; and 21 *Amphilochia* in Migne's edition of Photius; Paris, 1860.) His work on the life and writings of Photius will embrace three large volumes, and be divided into ten books. The first is devoted to the time before Photius; the following six books treat of the life of Photius. The eighth gives an account of his writings, the ninth discusses his theology, and the tenth is devoted to

the time after Photius, in order to show "how far his influence extended upon later times, how the weapons first furnished by him were subsequently used in the contest with the Latin Church, and how the schism begun by him became a permanent fact."

A very interesting contribution to the History of Christian Doctrines has been furnished by a work of Professor Caspari, of the University of Christiana, in Norway, entitled "Inedited Sources for the History of the Baptismal Symbol and the Rule of Faith." (*Ungedruckte Quellen zur geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel*, Vol. I. Christiana, 1866.) It contains two documents ascribed to Athanasius, a fragment of the Antiochene Baptismal Confession from the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, a Syriac translation of the Nicene and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creeds, the Baptismal Confessions of the Nestorians, a confession of faith of Bishop John of Jerusalem.

One of the most important works on the foreign missions of the Protestant Churches which has appeared in this part of theological literature is the "Universal Missionary Atlas," by Dr. R. Grundemann, (*Allgemeiner Missions Atlas*, Gotha, 1867.) It will consist of four parts, namely, 1. Africa, (twenty maps.) 2. Asia, inclusive of Turkey, (twenty-seven maps.) 3. Australia and Polynesia, (sixteen maps.) 4. America, (fifteen maps.) The first part, embracing Africa, will be published in three divisions, the first of which will contain eight, the second seven, and the third five maps. On each of the maps the stations of every particular society are marked by a special color. To each map is added two pages of text giving a geographical and historical description of the country, a brief outline of its missionary history, and the present statistics.

"Contributions to Christian Knowledge" (*Beiträge zur Christlichen Erkenntnis*, Basel, 1865) is a collection of essays and sermons from the late Dr. Auberlen, one of the ablest apologetic writers of Protestant Germany. The longest essay (occupying about one half of the volume,) is on faith, which belongs among the best theological productions of Auberlen.

Edouard Boehmer has written a very valuable and interesting work on two

pioneers of Protestantism in Spain. (*Francisco Hernandez, and Frai Francisco Ortiz*, Leipzig, 1865.) The information here given is mostly new, being derived from manuscripts which a German scholar, Dr. Gotthold Heine, obtained during a journey in Spain.

Among the strictly theological periodicals of Germany, a quarterly devoted exclusively to homiletics, and edited by E. Ohly, well deserves a cordial recommendation. Every number contains an elaborate treatise on a homiletical question, several sketches of sermons for each of the thirteen Sundays of the quarter, some religious poetry, and a full list of new theological books of Germany. (*Mancherlei Gaben und ein Geist. Homilet. Vierteljahrschrift*, Vol. V. Wiesbaden, 1866.)

Another quarterly, published by Dr. Heidenheim, pays special attention to the theological publications of the English literature. It contains many valuable articles on Oriental literature. (*Vierteljahrschrift für deutsch- und englisch-theologische Forschung*, Zurich, 1866.)

A very interesting contribution to the literature on the great Reformation of the sixteenth century is Dr. Burkhardt's "Correspondence of Dr. Luther." (*Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel*, Leipzig, 1866.) It contains more than three hundred letters of the great Reformer which have not been published before, and is therefore a valuable supplement to all previous collections.

The well-known manual of Church history by Dr. Hase (translated into English by Dr. Wing and Prof. Blumenthal) has appeared in an eighth edition, thoroughly revised, completed by the addition of the latest literature, and continued up to the present day. The work still maintains its reputation as one of the best of the kind in the whole of Protestant literature. (*Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig, 1867.) A new manual of the most recent Church history has been published by Dr. F. Nippold, Privat-docent of theology at the University of Heidelberg. (*Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, Elberfeld, 1867.) It is introduced by a preface from Dr. Rothe.

Of the works by Bishop Raess, of Strasburg, on the lives and works of those who since the Reformation have gone over from one of the Protestant

denominations to the Church of Rome, three volumes have thus far appeared, reaching to the year 1601. (*Die Con-vertirten*. Freiburg, 1866, sq.) The work will comprise about twelve volumes.

Among the Roman Catholic works announced as soon forthcoming, we find the sixth volume of Hefele's History of Councils.

FRANCE.

Of the new edition of the first fifty-four volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, the largest work on the saints of the Church of Rome, which is being published at Paris by Jean Oarnandet, twenty volumes have thus far appeared. (Vols. 1-12, 14-18, 46-48.) Every volume costs about twelve dollars, and every year ten volumes are published.

ART. IX.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, April, 1867.—

1. Historical Evidence as Affected by Time. 2. Hodgson on Time and Space. 3. Irenæus and Infant Baptism. 4. The Divine Names in the Hebrew Scriptures. 5. The Greetings of Paul. 6. Our Public Schools.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1867. (Philadelphia.)—

1. Rebaptism. 2. Meaning of the Word *κρίσις* in Romans viii, 19-23. 3. The Apostle Paul. 4. The Scriptural Anthropology. 5. The Fundamental Law of Christian Worship. 6. Open Communion.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, April, 1867. (Philadel-

phia.)—1. Western Presbyterianism. 2. The Epicurean Philosophy. 3. Emanuel Swedenborg. 4. The Position of the Book of Psalms in the Plan of the Old Testament. 5. The Philosophy of Mathematics.

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1867. (Gettysburg.)—

1. The Relation of the Sermon to the Church Year. 2. Church Discipline. 3. Daniel's Seventy Weeks. 4. The Millennium. Revelation of John, chap. xx. 5. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. 6. The Evidences of a Future State, as seen in the Analogies of Nature. 7. Theological Inquiry. 8. The Authorship of the Augsburg Confession. 9. Prayer. 10. How God Concurs in the Wicked Deeds of Men.

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1867. (Dover, N. H.)—

1. Sketches of Egypt. 2. Pioneer Free Baptist Ministers in Wisconsin. 3. The Spirit and Mission of the Scholar. 4. Life of Moses. 5. Life and Death Eternal. 6. The Conversion of Children. 7. The Shilohic Fullness of Time. 8. A Day at the Ruins of Baalbec.

NEW ENGLANDER, April, 1867. (New Haven.)—

1. Present Condition and Prospects of Unitarianism. 2. Divorce. Part II.—Doctrine of Divorce in the New Testament. 3. Church Communion by Council. 4. Ward's Life of Percival. 5. Thoughts on Public Worship. 6. The Late Rev. Dr. Dutton.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, April, 1867. (Boston.)—

1. Knowledge as an Instrument, an Ornament, and a Blessing. 2. The Possibility of Universal Salvation. 3. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ. 4. The Catacombs of Rome. 5. The Eternal Logos. 6. Longevity of the Antediluvians.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1867. (Boston.)—1. Modern Italian Poets. 2. British Finance in 1816. 3. Charles Lamb and his Biographers. 4. The New Jersey Monopolies. 5. The Railroad System. 6. Deaf-Mute Education. 7. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. 8. Lessing. 9. Religious Liberty.

The old North American is the patriarch, and has hitherto been the prince of American Quarterlies. In our boyhood and college life we accepted it, as we accepted the firmament, as of the established and natural system of things, an authority not to be criticised, but assumed as the standard of departure for criticism upon all other parts of the system. The graceful and liberal culture of Everett, Sparks, and Peabody, and the candid and cautious respect they maintained for religious institutes in which they did not coincide, rendered it possible for all sects and sections to accept it as a common literary representative. For the last four or five years, at least, its visits to our table, as an exchange, have, for reasons to us unknown, been suspended until the present number. During that interval it has passed into new editorial hands, and some important changes have been made. From the *officina* of Ticknor & Fields, it comes in statelier external style than ever. Its articles are marked with the same ability, and perhaps an increased point and trenchancy. In the present number the article on the New Jersey Monopoly takes rank, in its powerful exposure of existing abuse, with Parton's article on New York misgovernment. The article on the Railroad System will powerfully contribute to bring before the public mind the fact that corporate monopoly is the next great danger and despotism with which the nation must wage a desperate war. The literary articles on the Italian Poets, and on Longfellow, are in the best style of the old North.

But there are two articles by the editors which painfully assure us that the religious position of the North American is essentially changed. It abdicates the position of a national literary representative, and becomes the organ of a *sect*, or rather *set*. Precisely as the Boston Review is the organ of Old School Presbyterianism and ours of Methodism, *the North American is the trenchant and aggressive organ of outspoken skepticism*. The indecent Tom Paineism of these two articles is unmistakable. We question not the sincerity of the writers' views, nor their right to make the Review the means of their expression after the public are fairly warned what to expect; we only claim to pronounce the character of those views, and to hold the writers and the Review responsible for them. They have a right to assail Christianity, but they have no right to claim to be her literary representative. They

are welcome to insult the Christian Church and her ministry but they must allow us the right to warn every Christian gentleman in our land that every dollar he pays to sustain this Review is a contribution to the cause of infidelity.

The first of these two articles is a eulogy upon Lessing, an original prime mover in the inauguration of the infidel apostasy of Germany. Mr. Lowell is pleased to say :

At present the world has advanced to where Lessing stood, while the Church has done its best to stand stock-still; and it would be a curious, were it not a melancholy spectacle, to see the indifference with which the laity look on while theologians thrash their wheatless straw, utterly unconscious that there is no longer any common term possible that could bring their creeds again to any point of bearing on the practical life of men. Fielding never made a profounder stroke of satire than in Squire Western's indignant "Art not in the pulpit now! When art got up there, I never mind what dost say."

Let it be noted that this profound "stroke" is quoted by Lowell from an obscene English novel, "Tom Jones," written by a debauched London rowdy in his own proper spirit, and the reader will say that while it demonstrates the elevated purity of the pulpit that such depraved beings should hate and revile it, the man who genially quotes it not only plasters a nastiness upon the once fair page, but grades himself at the level of the original rowdy. Upon that "flat Bedford level" we leave Mr. James Russell Lowell.

Mr. Norton, the writer of the other of the two articles, does not possess the capacity for much mischief. His essay on Religious Liberty is a piece of the ordinary commonplace of his set. All opinions, he opines, are religiously of equally indifferent value. Even Atheism is as religious as any other creed. Then we have a plentiful sprinkle of the ordinary braggartisms and cant phrases of the set. We have "traditional theology," "old churches," "irrational dogmas;" and the stereotype boasts that the Christian system is to be now abolished in the true spirit of Voltaire's old "Ecraser l'infame." Mr. Norton of course reiterates the old mendacious gist that his views, even the making religion atheistically ignore a God, are the true religion of Jesus; just as Hume closes his Essay on Miracles with the irony that he is seeking to base Christianity on firmer principles than those of the "pretended Christians" he is refuting. Mr. Norton says this, but he does not himself believe it. He is aware of the fiction he utters. To Mr. Norton and his like, who seek to baptize Atheism into the name of the blessed Jesus, His divine reply is, "I know God, and if I should say I know him not, I should be a liar like unto you;" and there is a terrible record of prophecy that that same Jesus will one day reappear, "taking vengeance on all those that know not God and obey not the gospel

of his Son." Such is the Christianity of Jesus and his apostles; let Mr. Norton and his set study it with silent meditation.

The great evangelic Church of our present day, based upon the Old Testament and the New, successor of the prophets, apostles, and martyrs, the Church of the Trinity, the Atonement, and the Regeneration, stands at this moment refreshed with revival and the gift of the Spirit, exerting an aggressive power unparalleled since the Pentecostal day. Never was the spirit of holiness more intense within her heart, never her love for her precious central truths more vital, never her plans of world-wide conquest so bold and so sure, never were her machineries so vast. Behold her centenaries dowered with outpoured millions; and count her laymen rearing in massive granite her biblical institutes, for the very purpose, mark it well, of teaching *forever* the theology of James Arminius and John Chrysostom. While at home she is battling with vice and error in every form, dealing death-blows upon slavery, drunkenness, profanity, and infidelity, planting her spires on every hill and plain of all our land, she is distributing her Bibles by increasing millions to all the languages of our race, and commissioning her missionaries to every land of the habitable globe. And while these stupendous plans for human renovation are going forth in rapid progress, two silly gentlemen in or about Boston, heirs in regular line to the Porphyrys, Lessings, and Tom Paines, are still scribbling essays about the obsolescence of the Church and the destruction of Christianity! Truly they are not the first fools who have mistaken the cant of their own clique for the opinion of the world, nor imagined their own little horizon to coincide with the circumference of creation.

We conclude by promptly and firmly performing our duty in declaring that the old North American Review has fallen into very bad hands, and in its present position, whatever its claims upon the merely literary class, is unworthy the countenance of the distinctively Christian public. If James Russell Lowell feels it to be his mission to assail the Christian faith and the Christian Church; if the North American Review chooses to place itself at the head of the infidel press of our country; they must abdicate their position, the former as an unquestioned classic in American literature, the latter as the representative head of the American periodical press.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, April, 1867. Baltimore.—1. The Origin of the Late War. 2. Southern War Poetry. 3. The Teaching and the Study of Geometry. 4. De Tocqueville on the Sovereignty of the People. 5. The Legend of Venus. 6. Recent Histories of Julius Caesar.

7. Life, Character, and Works of Henry Reed. 8. Agricultural Chemistry. 9. Victor Hugo as a Novelist. 10. The New America of Mr. Dixon.

THE first article (written, we doubt not, by the editor) discusses and decides *the true cause of our great civil war*. Five different opinions are enumerated; and the fifth, which specifies *slavery* as the cause, is pronounced to be "the most superficial of all." On the contrary "the antagonism between the North and the South, so imperfectly adjusted by the labors of 1787, is the true standpoint from which to contemplate the origin of the late war." The whole theory is, therefore, that a natural, or at least permanent antagonism exists between the two sections, *as North and South*, that it was imperfectly adjusted by the Constitution, and that it underlay and took into itself all other causes in our late war; and the inference is obviously left uncontradicted, as we understand him, that it still and for ever survives for future contest.

We think this to be a very untrue and a very dangerous doctrine. We think it *untrue*; for there is no more proof of and no more reason for hostile antagonism between our North and South than between the British North and South, known as Scotland and England. All countries have a north and south; and they have also an east and west. The actual historical fact is, that it was *a purpose to create and to use this sectional issue* entertained by a knot of leaders—a purpose which no constitutional arrangement could obviate—which made the North and South a basis of contest. The alternative held forth by those sectional leaders to the North was *the supremacy of slavery or disunion!* The North most justly determined to accept neither. The war and the destruction of slavery are the condign result.

The doctrine, we think, is *dangerous*, for it is pregnant with future war. The propagation of the doctrine of an inherent sectional antagonism creates the antagonism. When a body of influential men base their own interest, fame, or fortune upon a sectional issue, they make it their life's business to create the feeling and establish the antagonism. The entire lessons of the past warn the leaders, both intellectual and political, of the South (as well as North) to beware of laying any further sectional platforms, or attempting to create any future sectional animosities. Without such efforts they would never hereafter exist.

We have ever affirmed that the true antislavery man is no sectional man. We never hated the South. We never assailed slavery, or anything else, because it was Southern. Had slavery been, like intemperance, a universally diffused wickedness, we

should have assailed it from whatever vantage ground it allowed us, in whatever intrenchment we found it. Our first battle with it was in the North and with the North, and we expect that our next moral battle will be with some Northern or national wickedness. We have ever entertained a more indulgent feeling for the southern-born slaveholder than for the northern supporter of black laws and negro disfranchisements. We attacked not a section, but an institution. We hated not the South, but slavery. We promptly take rank, however, with that "superficial" class who maintain that the true cause of the late war *was* slavery. That a few southern autocrats (who, as Edward Everett once said, "could be counted upon your fingers") used the slavery interest merely as a means for the establishment of a new empire for self-aggrandizement we, indeed, freely concede. But that slavery was the one great, efficient, indispensable *cause*, is as undeniable as that gravitation holds our marble structures to the earth. It was not because the writer of these lines was an anti-states-rights man, or because he was a Northerner, that for fifteen years his life would not have been safe in the South; but because he could colorably be styled "an abolitionist!" For thirty years the slavery question has been the one topic; the establishment or overthrow of slavery the one object of struggle; and all constitutional questions have been subordinate and instrumental. During that time, ninety-nine in a hundred of the issues made by the South against the North, in speeches, editorials, threats of disunion, and measures of hostility, have assumed the antislavery discussion as their ground. Yet we may, nevertheless, not regret that our Southern friends now repudiate slavery as the object of *their* struggle. We believe that when the defense of slavery becomes obsolete, sectional appeals and issues will disappear. We have heard intelligent Southerners express surprise that they find no hostile prejudice, no bitter feeling toward themselves, personally, as Southerners, anywhere in the North, not even in New England. We hope to live to see the time when the terms North and South shall sound as little antagonistic as East and West. We wish we could see some token in the Southern Quarterly of a similar wish.

We regret to note the omission also, in both numbers of this noble Quarterly, of all effort at pointing the South to the great work of developing her unrivaled resources, and building a future prosperity for which she has a world of means, far surpassing those of the North, on the solid basis of material value. We have the old error of Virginia abstractionism all over again; an absorption in political metaphysics, with an oblivion of all the means and

measures for the solid prosperity of the South. If Dr. Bledsoe would think less of sectionalizing, and more of tranquilizing, liberalizing, loyalizing, and nationalizing the South; if his Quarterly would deal less in metaphysics and more in physics; if he would discuss fewer political topics, and give an inspiration, a lead, and a guidance to the industrial, agricultural, and commercial enterprise of the South, he might, we trust, yet live to be the benefactor of his country.

English Reviews.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1867. (London.)—1. Ferdinand Christian von Baur. 2. Charles Lamb. 3. Banking Reform. 4. Church Buttresses. 5. Mrs. Gaskell. 6. Nichol's Puritan Divines. 7. The Post-Office and Electric Telegraph. 8. Stoughton's Ecclesiastical History. 9. Working Men and Religious Institutions.

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCE, April, 1867. (London.)—1. The Counter-Reformation in Bohemia. 2. Pelagius and Celestius. 3. English Poetry under the Stuarts. 4. The La Feronnays Family. 5. Conington's *Æneid* of Virgil. 6. The Scottish Liturgy. 7. New America. 8. The "Atrium and Basilica" of Dollinger.

JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE, April, 1867. (London.)—1. The Church and the Working Men. 2. Rites and Ceremonies. 3. On the Eternity of Future Punishments. 4. The Tripartite Nature of Man Considered in Relation to Evangelical Doctrines. 5. Mr. Hinton's Metaphysical Views. 6. The Breton Bible. 7. On Ritualism. 8. Plea for a Revised Translation of the Scriptures. 9. Positivism—The Pantheism of Auguste Comte. 10. The State of Parties in the Church of England. 11. The Book of Job—A Revised Translation. 12. The Liturgy of St. Celestine, Bishop of Rome. Syriac Text.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Character of George the Third. 2. Sea Fish and Fisheries. 3. Autobiography of a Physiologist. 4. Westmoreland. 5. The Poetry of Seven Dials. 6. M. Du Chaillu's Recent Travels. 7. Curious Myths of the Middle Ages. 8. New American Religions. 9. Railway Finance. 10. Wellington in the Peninsula. 11. The Four Reform Orators.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, March, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The Policy of Trades-Unions. 2. George Buchanan. 3. The Political Writings of Richard Cobden. 4. On the Character of the Old Northern Poetry. 5. Victor Cousin. 6. The Oyster-Fisheries. 7. Oxford University Extension. 8. The Bengal Famine of 1866.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1867. (London.)—1. The Divine and Human Natures in Christ. 2. The Liberal Theology. 3. The Sensational Philosophy—Mr. J. S. Mill's Theory of Mind. 4. Renan's History of the Apostles. 5. The organized Structure of the New Testament. 6. Trials of Irving and Campbell of Row. 7. *Cyclopædia Literature*. 8. Interpretation of the Psalms. 9. The Antiquity of Man.

The ninth article furnishes a valuable zoological answer to the proofs of man's geological antiquity, derived from human remains

found among those of extinct animals, as in various caves and in the Rhine valleys.

In the deposits containing the early indications of man are found the remains of animals, some of which are still living; and others, like the warmly clad mammoth, and the two-horned woolly rhinoceros, are extinct. To admit this is, in the opinion of many geologists, to acknowledge the great antiquity demanded by some modern writers for man. Lyell, in the opening sentence of his work devoted to this subject, summarizes the whole question in the single inquiry, "Whether or no we have sufficient evidence in caves, or in the superficial deposits, to prove the former co-existence of man with certain extinct mammalia?" We can have no hesitation in replying to this in the affirmative. But to what does this commit us? The point and importance of the question lie in the word "extinct." To the geologist this conveys the idea of great antiquity. But that this is a pure assumption will be evident, if we examine the relation which the extinct animals of Britain bear to this living fauna.

Dr. Fleming, in his *Philosophy of Zoology*, (1822,) pointed out the importance of taking into account the animals which formerly inhabited a country in constructing a fauna; he further advocated this method in the paper to which we have already alluded, and he practically illustrated his views in his subsequently published *British Animals*.

The geologist is familiar with the appearance and disappearance of numerous species of animals, whose remains are preserved in the rocks of the earth. This has originated the notion that species, like individuals, have a term of life. At first they appear in small numbers, then increase in importance, afterward decline, and finally disappear. The natural death of a species is spoken of as something corresponding to the natural death of an individual. Whatever truth there may be in this opinion, in regard to the animals that lived in past geological periods, the testimony of history and observation, in regard to the decline of plants and animals on the earth, or their disappearance from it in recent times, is that man is the great agent, either directly or indirectly, in producing such changes. He has within half a century almost destroyed the indigenous flora of St. Helena, and introduced plants from all quarters of the globe belonging to genera totally different from those originally growing on the island. In Britain he has greatly reduced in numbers some of the native animals, others he has completely extirpated from the island, and some of these have shared the same fate elsewhere, so that they are no longer living on the globe—they are extinct. The three kinds of British deer—the stag, the fallow-deer, and the roe—have long been favorite objects of the huntsman's pursuit. Bishop Lesley, in his *De Rebus gestis Sotorum*, (1578,) says that in his day as many as from five hundred to one thousand deer were slain at one hunting match, by the use of bloodhounds and grayhounds. But for the preserved forests, these animals would long ago have perished from our native fauna. Some animals have been brought within narrow bounds, from being hunted for their furs, as the otter, the martin, and the polecat; while others, as the wild cat and fox, have been greatly reduced in numbers, and driven into the more uncultivated and inaccessible districts, because of their preying on domestic animals. All these, however, still exist in Britain, but there are others that have not so successfully resisted the persecution of man. The bear continued to exist till the year 1057, and a century later the wild boar abounded in some English forests, but both fell victims to the attacks of the huntsman. The beaver was a common tenant of our rivers in early times, but its highly prized fur caused its extirpation about the twelfth century; while the wolf was found in Scotland till beyond the middle of the seventeenth century, and in Ireland even later. Numerous skulls and other bones of the *Urus* of Cæsar (*Bos primigenius*) have been found in Britain, but no information exists as to the period of its extirpation in this country. On the continent, however, it was seen by Julius Cæsar, and survived even long after his time. In his account of the Black Forest, in the sixth book of his Gallic War, he gives a description of this now extinct animal, and of the effectual means which were adopted for its destruction. We shall quote the passage, as it is of great importance in connection with this

subject. "The *Uri* are but little less than elephants in size, and are of the species, form, and color of a bull. Their strength is very great, and also their speed. They cannot be brought to endure the sight of men, nor be tamed, even when taken young. The people who take them in pit-falls assiduously destroy them; and young men harden themselves in this labor, and exercise themselves in this kind of chase; and those who have killed a great number—the horns being publicly exhibited in evidence of the fact—obtain great honor." History does not record the fate of the extinct animals which co-existed with the *Urus*; they were probably extirpated before Cæsar visited Germany, but the means adopted for the extinction of this huge animal, and the result, make it probable that man had more to do with the disappearance of all these now extinct quaternary mammals than has been supposed.

The same influences have been operating against the birds as against the quadrupeds of Britain. Eagles and ravens, snipes and lapwings, have been driven, by the gun or cultivation, to restricted districts, within the memory of many now living. The large wood grouse or capercaillie, was found in the pine forests of Scotland till past the middle of last century, the last individual having been killed, as it is believed, in the year 1769. It is now unknown, except in those preserved plantations into which it has been reintroduced from Norway, where it is still abundant. But the most remarkable fact bearing on the question before us, in connection with our native birds, is the very recent extinction of the great auk. This bird was seen so lately as 1822 by Dr. Fleming, who had for some time a living specimen, but it is now not only extirpated from Britain, but it has entirely perished from off the earth. Skins of this bird exist in several collections, but the only skeleton in the British Museum has been recently obtained from a guano deposit in Newfoundland. In our own day the great auk has become extinct.

It is thus evident that a bed is not necessarily very ancient because some of its fossil contents belong to animals that are no longer living.

Dr. Fleming in the paper to which we have referred on the Distribution of British Animals, examined the evidence in regard to man's relation to these extinct animals, and arrived at the same conclusion as that recently arrived at by Lyell. His own words are, "The remains of these extinct animals occur only in the superficial strata, and in fresh water gravel or clay, and may be viewed as connected with the last or modern epoch of the earth's history. Man was an inhabitant of this country at the time these animals flourished, his houses and his instruments having been found in similar situations with their remains." Sir Charles Lyell in his "Antiquity of Man," a work which so much astounded the world, and was declared to have subverted the history of man as recorded in the Mosaic record, finds no facts in support of a greater antiquity than those that were before Dr. Fleming, and are published in this paper. But the conclusion of the two authors are very different. They have both the same question to solve, but they approach it from different directions. Fleming treats the question as a zoologist, and reasoning from the known, from the actual changes produced in the fauna of the country within six or eight centuries, he maintains that, "if we consider the dispersion of the human race over the earth's surface, and the unremitting persecution which they have carried on against the lower animals, during the long term of nearly six thousand years, varying their destructive weapons with the progress of improvements, and extending their ravages with the increase of their wants, we come to the conclusion, that man must have altered greatly the geographical range of many species, and may even have succeeded in effecting the total destruction of not a few." Among these he includes the extinct animals which were man's contemporaries.

Important corroborative testimony is given by the archaeologist in support of the comparatively limited time required by the zoologist. The investigation into the early traces of man on the globe are as properly within the domains of archaeology as of geology. There is here a common ground of inquiry legitimately open to both sciences. The archaeologist ascends to it from the present, like the zoologist, but he has more historical material to form a basis for his inquiries. He has all the light that sacred and profane history throws on the early manners, customs, and employment of different people; he has the information supplied by

the deciphered inscriptions of Egypt and Nineveh; he has the numerous instructive ancient sculptures of different peoples; and in addition to all this, he is able to study among his contemporaries in different parts of the world races representing almost all stages of civilization, from the primitive manufacturers of the rude Abbeville hatchets to the most advanced natives of Caucasian descent. With all these certain data, and with the numerous checks which present themselves in his investigations, it is evident that his testimony would be of importance in approximating to an estimate as to the age of man. If it supported the "vast distance of time" required by some geologists, it might cause us to doubt whether or not the zoologist might not have greatly under-estimated the time required for the changes in the animal kingdom: but when we find it supporting and confirming the more limited estimate, it must compel us at once to get rid of any lingering notions that there be more in the geological view than what we have perceived. An illustration will exhibit the relation that a geological estimate bears to the more certain computation by the antiquarian. The late Mr. L. Horner excavated the Nile mud from the base of the statue of Rameses at Memphis, for the purpose of ascertaining what thickness of sediment had been deposited since that statue was erected. Accepting the determination by Lepsius, that the year 1361 B. C. was in the middle of the reign of Rameses, and assuming this as the probable date of the foundation of the statue, he found that during the space of three thousand two hundred and eleven years (up till 1850) a deposit of nine feet four inches had taken place round the pedestal, or at the rate of three and one half inches in a century. Assuming this to have been the uniform rate of increase, he continued his examination by boring to a depth of thirty-two feet, where he reached the sand of the desert. In the lowest layer of the mud a fragment of burnt brick was found, which at the assumed rate of deposit would be thirteen thousand years old. Fragments of pottery, as well as portions of brick, were found in others of the many borings that were carried on under his direction, all attesting an equally great antiquity. The pottery was, however, declared to be of Roman manufacture; and even Sir Charles Lyell, in summing up his account of these investigations, allows that "the experiments by Mr. Horner are not considered by experienced Egyptologists to have been satisfactory."

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1867. (London.)—1. Religious Prospects in France. 2. Scientific Farming. 3. The Civil Service of the British Empire. 4. Apollonius of Tyana. 5. Swiss Lake Dwellings. 6. Smiles's Lives of the Engineers. 7. Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately.

The fifth article very satisfactorily disposes of the argument in favor of the pre-Adamic antiquity of man, from the Swiss lake-dwellings. In the winter of 1853 and 1854 the Swiss lakes sunk to a remarkably low level, and disclosed the relics of ancient houses and villages built upon piles, far into the depths of the lakes. They were brought under the inspection of Dr. Keller, president of the Antiquarian Society of Zurich, who made record of his observations, which form the basis of the present article. Further researches disclosed a vast variety of similar remains in different localities. An immense number of the relics betoken ancient human life, and disclose different epochs of civilization, indicated as the *stone period*, the *brass period*, and the *iron period*. Implements of daily use, and cereals and animals used as food, are abundant. Bones of the urus and aurochs indicate antiquity, and a period of at least seven thousand years has been demanded for

the present problem. The claim may, for the present, be considered as settled and dismissed by the following remarks:

We find no scientific compulsion, however, which insists upon a very enormous antiquity for the pile dwellings. We do not admit this compulsion in view of the question of the antiquity of the human race as a whole. It may be perfectly true—we suppose it cannot be honestly denied—that man has co-existed in Western Europe with the mammoth, the rhinoceros tichorinus, and other extinct mammals. But there is another explanation of this phenomenon besides the theory which runs man's age in the earth up into a dozen or twenty millenniums beyond the starting points of history. Suppose, instead of man being so much older than we used to think him, it should turn out that *our mammals are so much younger, and that the rhinoceros and mammoth period must be brought lower down, and not the human period pushed further back.* So far as we know, science has not shown the improbability of this hypothesis; and, until it is proved untenable, we hold it as, in view of everything, a more scientific solution of the question in debate than that furnished by its rival. Here, however, neither Robenhausen nor any other phenomena with which we have to do demand, or even need, a space of time greater than some one or two thousand years before the Christian era. While we believe, with Dr. Keller, that a high antiquity must be assigned to the so-called stone settlements, we are not surprised to hear M. Troyon, near the outset of his volume, say: "Let it be well understood, then, that the stone age—the relics of which are discovered in the lakes and in the graves—is recognized, in this work, as subsequent to the Mosaic deluge."

Further, we heartily indorse Dr. Keller's conviction, that the lake dwellers, whatever the time of their coming into Switzerland, and how great and numerous soever the changes which passed upon them during their long occupation of the country, were one and the same people. M. Troyon contends that the nationality of the stone people was quite distinct from that of the race which used the metal implements, and that the establishment of bronze and iron settlements upon the territory occupied by those of stone must be attributed to immigration and conquest. Dr. Keller argues, and we think triumphantly, that the facts of the case are strongly opposed to such a theory. Two considerations alone, both urged by Dr. Keller, appear to us to be fatal to the idea of successive and diverse populations. In the first place, it is incredible that two or three distinct races should all take to the unnatural and laborious way of living adopted by the pile dwellers. If bronze men or iron men had invaded the country of the stone men, and had made themselves masters of their settlements, it is morally certain they would most carefully abstain from the practice of living in huts built on the tops of timbers thrust into lake bottoms. And, again, if this were supposable, it is not supposable that such heterogeneous populations should drive their piles, and lay their platforms, and build and furnish their houses, and fashion their chief implements, as was the fact with the lake dwellers, all on the same model. Nothing is more certain than that the pile dwellings in every age are constructed in precisely the same manner; and how this circumstance can be made to tally with M. Troyon's theory, or with any other theory than that of the race-unity of the lake-dwelling people, we are at a loss to understand.

What, then, was the nationality of the Swiss lake dwellers? M. Troyon says that the men of bronze were Celts, and that the men of stone were a pre-Celtic population. Dr. Keller maintains that all were Celts together. His words in summing up are:

"Believing as we do that the different settlements in what are called the stone, the bronze, and the iron ages, do not indicate a succession of races or the destruction of one people by another, but merely different grades of civilization among one and the same people, and a continued progress in handicraft ability; believing also that the lake dwellers did not form a peculiar caste, but, as is shown at Ebersberg and other places, belonged to the very people who at the same time lived on the main land; and knowing that according to the universal opinion of many French and English antiquaries, the bronze objects of a peculiar form and

quite as peculiar ornamentation, such as those found in the settlements, both on the land and in the lakes, have always been attributed to the Celts; knowing also that history makes no mention of any other people but the Celts who in the very earliest ages possessed the middle of Europe, and in later times received their civilization from the Romans, we believe that it would be contrary to all the facts adduced to arrive at any other conclusion but this, that the builders of the lake dwellings were a branch of the Celtic population of Switzerland, but that the earlier settlements belong to the pre-historic period, and had already fallen into decay before the Celts took their place in the history of Europe."—P. 313.

To this finding—a finding which sorts exactly with all we know of the Helvetii and Celtic populations of Central Europe in general, whether from Caesar or other ancient authorities—we give our cordial adhesion. Subject to the correction of future discovery, we hold with Dr. Keller, that our lake dwellers were a portion of that great Celtic migration which started, when the world was young, from the steppes and waters of High Asia; that they came, we know not when, but many hundreds of years before Christ, into Switzerland, bringing with them the dog, cow, sheep, goat, and horse, understanding agriculture likewise, and cultivating wheat, barley, and flax; that moved by some mysterious idiosyncrasy of race, and urged by pressure of external circumstances, they addicted themselves to the strange fashion of living which we have described in the foregoing pages; and that the habit of such a manner of life being formed, and corroborated by their lot, they continued age after age to follow their primeval customs, till the power and civilization of the Romans came and abolished them for ever.—Pp. 423–25.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Italy and the War of 1866. 2. The Papal Drama. 3. Thomas Hobbes. 4. Contemporary Music and Musical Literature. 5. New America. 6. Mr. Swinburne's Poetry. 7. The Hopes and Fears of Reformers.

The Westminster is the great master and model of infidel literature, whose tactics an increasing amount of the American press is ambitiously struggling to ape. It assails every institution and doctrine of Christianity; the Bible, the Christ-history, the Church of all denominations, the pulpit, the religious press and literature; but in all this persistent process it claims to be Christian, religious, the true follower of Jesus, and resents with fierceness the bigotry that questions its really superior religiosity. To all this duplicity the present number contains a significant passage, which perhaps furnishes the true key. *The assumption of the Christian name is provisional.* It is to last only so long as the power and prestige of the great orthodox Church overawes a perpendicular profession of infidelity. When that dread influence expires the name of Christ will be repudiated, and the very word *Christianity* will be consigned to contempt.

This question of a name has much more importance than would seem at first sight properly to belong to it; for if the name be retained, it would imply with many the retaining of all the accretions and falsities which have gathered round it; and if the name be dropped, the truths, practical and speculative, which have been implicated in Christianity, even under its corrupt forms, would appear to some to be rejected with it. Mr. Mackay does not definitely deal with this question. Perhaps he would adopt Lessing's solution, calling the religion of reason "the religion of Christ," in contradistinction to the "Christian religion"—a religion striving to appropriate Christ's sentiments and character instead of idly

following or worshipping his person. Or, as the liberal Christians in the Dutch Church describe it, by saying the Christian Church is founded on a following of what Christ taught, not on a speculation concerning what he was. Still, even to this extent the historical ground is not so firm beneath our feet as we should desire. For if we admit that "the true principle of Christianity," as we would understand it, "as well as of morality, may be called self-regulated liberty;" or, say that Christianity and morality alike indicate the "convergence and consistency of freedom and obligation," and that if the Christian law is a "law of liberty," (James i, 25; ii, 12,) "morality admits no better definition than freedom well understood;" or, that "love is the fulfilling of the law," with St. Paul, as with Aristotle it comprehended justice, *wherein do we find a differentia for Christianity?* Or if, when stripped of its husk, Christianity is nothing more than true morality, may they nevertheless legitimately assume the special name of Christians who have, as a matter of historical fact, derived their morality (with whatever "accidents") from the personal teaching of Jesus Christ; or here again must they concede that they have derived it from the teaching attributed to a Christ in some of his words and acts ideal? In such case, whatever they might willingly call themselves, will others acquiesce in what will be termed the usurpation of a sacred title? These are of course merely practical questions, and *not such as press for the present for an answer; but sooner or later they will require one.*

This not-to-be-forgotten passage at once exhibits some of the subterfuges by which the Christian name is to be colorably retained "for the present," and points to the "sooner or later" when antichrist will reveal himself under his own true title. How far behind in this march of boasted "progress" will our "Nation" and "Tribune" linger?

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.) 1867. Third Number. 1. **ACHELIS**, On the Oath of God with Himself. 2. **SCHRADER**, The Duration of the Second Temple. 3. **LINDER**, Remarks on some Passages of the New Testament. 4. **PAUL**, A few more Remarks on the Time of the Lord's Supper according to John. 5. **ZAHN**, Additional Remarks on the article "Papias of Hierapolis." Reviews of Lagarde's *Constitutiones Apostolorum* and *Clementina*; **WOLTERS'S** *Der Heidelberger Catechismus*; **SCHMIDT**, *Encyclopädie des gesammten Erziehungs und Unterrichtswesens*, and of an Anonymous Work on the Reconstruction of the Established Church of Prussia.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (JOURNAL FOR SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.) 1867. First Number. 1. **HOLTZMANN**, the Address of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2. **DR. OVERBECK**, Two New Testimonies of Papias for the Acts and the Fourth Gospel. 3. **LIPSIG**, the Times of Marcion and Heracleon. 4. **HILGENFELD**, Protestant and Roman Opponents. (Tischendorf and Langen.) 5. **MERX**, Remark on the Syriac Translation of the Ignatian Epistles. 6. **HILGENFELD**, the Essenes and Jesus.

The system of the Essenes is still a favorite subject of discussion for German scholars. Most of them agree with Baur and Zeller, who find its origin in an influence of Pythagorism, or at least of Orphish-Bacchish Asceticism upon Judaism. Dr. Ewald's

opinion that Essenism sprang from the same school of pious men (תַּסְרִירָא, 'Ασιδαῖοι) from which previously the Pharisees had sprung, has been supported only by Dr. Geiger, a Jewish writer. Dr. Ritschl, who derived Essenism from a desire to establish a universal priesthood of the chosen people of God, has likewise met with but little approval. Dr. Hilgenfeld, in the above number of the *Journal of Scientific Theology*, undertakes to prove the historical connection of Essenism with Parsism and Buddhism. He is of opinion that the Jews in Babylonia, even after the destruction of the Persian empire, constituted the connecting link between the Jewish religion and the system of Zoroaster, and that the influence of the former upon the latter was strengthened by the restoration of a Persian empire under the Arsacidæ, (250 before Christ.) Buddhism, on the other hand, had become known outside of India since Alexander the Great, and had in particular begun to exercise a strong influence upon Parsism. Dr. Hilgenfeld then points out the doctrines and usages which he thinks are common to Essenes and the Magi of Parsism. Both appear as soothsayers, foretellers of future events. The division into three classes, (novices of the first years, novices of the two following years, and members of the order;) the hatchet, girdle, white habit, and sacred baths of the novices; the solemn oath which was taken upon entering the order, and which was the only oath ever allowed them; the abstinence from meat, wine, and bloody sacrifices; the abandonment of private property; the observance of silence before the rising of the sun; the veneration shown to the sun; the belief in predestination and the peculiar views of a future state—are mentioned among the tenets that are common to both systems. Many of these points are also to be found in Buddhism, to the influence of which religion Hilgenfeld also traces the distinction of four degrees of perfection among the members of the order, the recommendation of celibacy, the belief in the equality of all men, and the consequent opposition to all kinds of servitude, the prominent importance attributed to the virtues of compassion and almsgiving. The influence of Buddhism upon Judaism, Dr. Hilgenfeld thinks, was all the easier, as, according to Buddhist writers, Buddhism, about the time of the third Œcumenical Council of Buddhism, which was held in 247 or 246 B. C., was flourishing at Alexandria, and as the Therapeutæ of Egypt show an even greater similarity with Buddhism than the Essenes of Palestine. Comparing Essenism with the teachings of Christ and the life of the primitive Church, Dr. Hilgenfeld regards Essenism as the highest approach of the ante-Christian times toward Christianity, and he thinks that

the attempt to establish community of goods in the primitive Church and the lifetime of the apostles seem to indicate a historical connection with Essenism.

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D.,
Baldwin Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
8vo., pp. 428. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

Most of the materials of this volume have passed through several phases, and have thus been subjected to the tests of criticism and time. Dr. Shedd's position for fifteen years in the Auburn Theological Seminary brought them before young candidates for the ministry in the form of lectures. As articles in his denominational Review, a portion of them have awakened considerable interest; and now, combined with two or three separate essays, and thoroughly revised, they are reproduced in the present volume. Clear statement, vigorous thought, and an evangelical spirit pervade its pages. Most treatises on homiletics are dry and tedious, perhaps from their scientific style and multiplicity of details, which may be very necessary in works designed to present all that can be said on the subject; but this is fresh and glowing to the close. Dr. Shedd writes for practical men, and says all that such men need. We like the book: we like its principles. We wish they might be burned into the souls of the entire ministry of the land. The doctor writes sometimes with a free pen, but we are not sure but we like those parts the best. He seems to have selected those rules which, as an instructor, and perhaps in his own experience, he had found most efficient in the formation of a good preacher, and boldly rejects much that some other writers have thought of value, as contributing to confusion and embarrassment.

Dr. Shedd sets out with the conviction that the great need of the Church at the present day is a "masculine and vigorous rhetoric, wedded with an earnest and active pastoral zeal." This is the key-note of the volume. Preaching is, with him, a speaking to the popular mind upon the subject of religion with a view to influence it. Certain facts in regard to God and man are to be established, and certain religious truths are to be impressed upon all who come to hear; and the permanence of the impression

which is made constitutes the true test of excellence in a sermon. The sermon is not an essay or a treatise, but an address to an audience. Like an address upon a secular topic, it must be oratorical in its form and style. It is an oration upon the most sacred of subjects, "more solid and weighty in its contents, more serious and earnest in its tone, and more sober in its coloring, than the deliberative, or judicial, or panegyric oration of secular eloquence;" but, nevertheless, an oration, employing all the powers of the mind in an effort to move the will of the hearer.

Fundamental to such a "masculine and vigorous rhetoric" is a thorough understanding of the word of God. The preacher's spirit must be pervaded by the Spirit of revelation. There is the truth which must be uttered, given by authority of God himself under the inspiration of his Spirit. Exegetical study alone can give freshness and force to the utterances of the minister, so that he will speak as the oracles of God, with authority. Preaching is his business: it is the work to which his life is consecrated, and to it his best intellectual strength must be given. Let him, then, be thorough, "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." There is a general preparation for it, covering years of study and toil, as in the cultivation of a homiletic mental habit; the formation of a high ideal of a sermon, with constant efforts to reach it; an absolute self-reliance in the immediate construction of a sermon, discarding the skeletons and discourses of others, and never "stealing" them, for that is unnecessary for him who has formed correct habits, and unwise and wicked for any; and above all, the maintenance of a spiritual mind. In the immediate preparation of the sermon, our author will not allow a word to be written until the intellect and heart are brought into a fervid and awakened condition, in which the feelings are warm and glowing. There is doubtless some power in the truth itself to induce this state of mind, but it is to be sought especially in devout meditation and earnest prayer. Then let him give himself entirely to the task of composition, avoiding prolixity, and driving home with all his might the one idea of the sermon. A preacher who acts upon these principles will be likely to confine his topics of discourse to the evangelical doctrines of the Bible; to speak of sin and guilt, of grace and redemption, in preference to the more philosophic themes of immorality and virtue; to use great directness of style and speech; and to take care always to speak with a loving heart as he rebukes iniquity, and repeats the threatenings of the Almighty. Such preaching cannot fail to do good, and it is needed everywhere.

As to style, Dr. Shedd's work itself illustrates the three essential properties which he names, plainness, force, and beauty. He finds, too, really, only three classes of sermons, the topical, textual, and expository. He advises that one sermon of each Sabbath be extemporaneous, that is, unwritten, but as thoroughly thought out as if it were written. The chapter devoted to the department of liturgies is not the least important or interesting; and the subject is one that deserves a better attention than is sometimes given it, especially as regards the selection and reading of hymns and the Holy Scriptures.

Rather more than one fourth of the volume is devoted to pastoral theology. Dr. Shedd has an exalted view of the office of pastor, and the only correct one. "The foundation of influence in parochial life," he says, "is in the clergyman's character, and the root of clerical character is piety." The pastor is the preacher speaking to individuals privately and personally, going from house to house, and making himself felt religiously in the social and domestic life of his people. The pastor's very calling demands eminent spirituality, and tends to its culture. His position requires a high intellectual character, that he may exert an influence upon all classes of men. These thoughts are fully elaborated, as are also the duties of pastoral visiting and catechizing, and in a charming style. The author is, on these topics, a decided conservative. He knows no new and patented mode of ministerial life, by which what some think its drudgery may be avoided, and the Church still built up. The only path he knows is that of patient, hard, earnest toil. It is, indeed, the only path which in the long run leads to real success.

D. A. W.

Studies in the Gospels. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo., pp. 326. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1867.

"Have little or nothing to do with commentaries," said an old clerical wiseacre to a young inquiring minister; "let commentaries alone, and your preaching will at least be original, your ideas will be your own." "Have nothing to do with books on the stars," as well might an old professor say to a young astronomer; "look at the skies and your thoughts will be original, and quite your own." This young astronomer would thereby know little of astronomy; and this young preacher would know just as little of the depth of Scripture truth. The simple looker at the skies has from time immemorial been able to guide his bark safely by

the north star; and the simple reader of the Bible has been able to direct his path to the blessed haven. But what knows the former of the immensity of God's system of worlds; and what knows the latter of the immense depth of God's truth in his word? The advances in natural science have hardly been more unequivocal than the advances in expository science. If any one doubts this, let him read the Gospel narrative of the Temptation as most persons read it thirty years ago, or as it appears in Clarke's Commentary, and then read it in the light of Dr. Trench's exposition, to say nothing of those which have preceded it during the last ten years; and surely he must admit that commentary on God's word is a most advancing science; and that he who neglects it is very likely to be quite unfit to expound the word of God in the Church of God.

Dr. Trench's expositions in the present volume are the result of an extensive miscellaneous reading, of a close scrutiny of the sacred text, and especially of a wide and thorough study of—COMMENTATORS; commentators ancient and modern, commentators Catholic and Protestant, commentators in Greek and Latin, in German, French, and English. And it is wonderful to note how much the jejuneness of the commentators of fifty years ago resulted from neglect of the ancient commentators. Dr. Trench's special favorites are Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Maldonatus. How deep, copious, and acute his expositions thence become, those who are familiar with his works on the Miracles and on the Parables may readily anticipate; for although the present volume can scarce be considered equal to those of its predecessors, yet it is amply worthy their learned author.

Sixteen passages from the Gospels are treated; of which the Temptation, the Samaritan Woman, the Transfiguration, and the Penitent Thief are the principal. In our few notes here on Dr. Trench, our readers must allow us to refer freely to our own labors over the same ground. The lovers of Scripture exposition must not infer from our touching upon points of disagreement only that they will not find this volume a rich treat.

On the Temptation Dr. Trench clearly and forcibly illustrates the fact that Satan proposed to Christ to become—just what the world would have its Messiah be—ANTICHRIST; the false Christ which Secularism and Rationalism to this hour are worshiping. When he comes to the question, Could Christ have sinned? he notices the argument that moral merit in refusing requires possibility of consenting; but he still maintains an *impossibility*, in the instance of Jesus, falsely imagining that he clears the difficulty by

pronouncing it a "moral" impossibility. What is this *moral impossibility*? If it means such a measurement of psychological motive force upon the will as to render the yielding to sin sequently impossible to the will by the law of cause and effect, or of antecedent and consequent, then moral merit is destroyed. If it does not mean this, then there is no "impossibility," moral or non-moral, in the case. If it does mean this, then there was no moral desert. Dr. Trench wanders from the point when he tells us that there was here in Christ "something higher than free-will," (*liberum arbitrium*,) namely, the blessed *necessity of good*, (*beata necessitas boni*.) The question is not how *high* the elements here are; but are there the conditions of moral merit or demerit? Was Christ a free agent, able to accept or reject? And any necessity, moral or physical, high or low, that excludes that alternative power, voids the merit of the act. Such is the sound old Arminian doctrine.

Dr. Trench, in his exposition of the two disciples walking from Emmaus, dismisses summarily the belief that one of the two was Luke himself. We could wish that the reader would compare our argument (on Luke xxiv, 13) in favor of that belief. Nor is it an unimportant point; for if Luke was at Jerusalem at this time, he was also probably present at the scene of Pentecost, (as we hope to make plausible in a future volume,) and was himself part of the first Jerusalem Church, whose early history he so richly describes. Those who have read Rénan's "Apostles" will see how such a view refutes his assaults upon the credibility of the first half of Acts.

Dr. Trench, in his exposition of the Penitent Thief, discards the plain statement of an evangelist that both thieves at first reviled Christ. We have shown, however, we trust, in our commentary on Matt. xxvii, 45-50, and 55-61, that this relenting of the thief from a previous reviling perfectly synchronized with a relenting of all present at the crucifixion, during and succeeding the hours of darkness and earthquake. This general relenting is a point suggested by Blunt; but has been overlooked, we believe, universally by commentators, and its solution of the change in the penitent thief has been entirely unseen. The same change took place, for instance, in the Centurion who first crucified and then confessed Jesus to be Son of God.

The Minor Prophets. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical; designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. HENRY COWLEE. 12mo., pp. 424. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

Our judgment of this work will be best expressed by comparing it with others occupying the same field of investigation—taking

into view the author's aim, and ascertaining how far he has been successful in reaching it. Passing by the voluminous commentaries of those who have undertaken to expound the whole of the sacred writings, and even the works of a few who have made the interpretation of prophecy a special study, (such as Bishop Newton, now nearly obsolete,) we notice first of all the "Critical, Philological, and Exegetical Commentary of Henderson, which has been highly and deservedly esteemed by every diligent and earnest student of the Bible for its philological research and critical acumen; and for the learning, trustworthiness, and practical value of its notes, entitling it to a place in every minister's library; and which has not been wholly superseded by any later works on the same portions of Holy Scripture. We observe, next, the incomparable "Explanatory and Practical" Commentary of Dr. Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, of which only three parts have yet appeared, (Hosea to Micah,) a work on which the author informs us he has spent more than thirty years. From a scholar and divine at once so learned, laborious, and devout, we are prepared to expect much; nor does his work disappoint us. It stands, like the wisdom and glory of Solomon, unequalled by all that have preceded it, and we may venture to say, will be long unsurpassed by any that shall come after it. If an expositor of the Holy Scriptures is bound to furnish a faithful rendering of the original text, to "give the sense," and "cause" us "to understand the reading," then Dr. Pusey has ably met the obligation, having given us throughout the literal meaning of the text, evolved, after mature study, without needless show of learning, or embarrassing and diverting discussion. He seldom departs from our standard English version, except where the translators have failed to understand and represent the original; and he invariably justifies the changes he makes. While he diligently uses grammars, lexicons, ancient and modern versions, and examines "every commentator likely or unlikely to contribute anything to the understanding of the sacred text," he is careful not to be used by any of them. His pages are not sprinkled with Hebrew or Arabic type, nor the dimensions of his exposition swollen with an array of names and authorities exhibited for display—quoted to be confuted, or to sustain his own interpretations. Such pedantry Dr. Pusey studiously eschews, esteeming it as valueless as it is cheap and popular. He presents us with the results of the latest and ripest criticism, without exhibiting the process by which it was reached. He sets before us the majestic and stately temple unsurrounded by the unsightly

scaffolding employed in its erection; and even brings us within its sacred precincts, where we behold the transcendent beauty of its treasures, influencing our faith, reverence, and obedience. In a word, he has developed "the meaning of Holy Scripture out of Holy Scripture itself;" and exhibits to his readers "truth side by side with the fountain from which it is drawn, enabling them to see something more of its riches than a passer-by or a careless reader sees upon its surface." We hope soon to possess it completed, and that an American edition of it may be speedily brought out. To ministers especially we heartily commend it.

The work of Mr. Cowles is unlike either of the former in not a few respects. It is less critical and philological than Henderson's, and is neither so scholarly, copious, and practical as Pusey's. Nevertheless, to thousands in America, to whom these works are almost inaccessible, it will prove of high value. His method is to "meet the wants, not of Hebrew scholars only or chiefly, but of all English readers;" and "specially those who have been and are yet to be trained to thoughtful study of God's word in Sabbath-schools and Bible classes, and, indeed, all those lay men and women who love the sacred Scriptures, and who naturally wish to know their full and precise meaning." In the main, it has been his "plan to give results only, and not the processes by which they have been reached," yet points of great practical interest and value. For example, "those prophecies respecting Messiah and his kingdom which yet remain in part to be fulfilled," he has "deemed it important to discuss fundamentally and thoroughly, so that the reader may see what principles of interpretation" he "adopts," and why; and also, to what results they have led him. Here we may properly inquire, How far has our author been successful in accomplishing what he has undertaken? Admirably well, we reply, according to our humble judgment. The primary "sense" of the prophet's language is in most instances clearly apprehended, and expressed with commendable brevity and force; and this is no small praise, and we cheerfully accord it. His principles of prophetic interpretation we would pronounce sound and evangelical, avoiding the extremes of unbridled rationalism on the one hand, and of an overstrained supernaturalism on the other. Without pledging ourselves to every interpretation which he has given, we allow that he has, nevertheless, supplied us with a valuable "help to the better understanding" of a portion of the Holy Scriptures, on which it is by no means easy to write a satisfactory commentary. Two dissertations, one "On the Criteria for distinguishing, in the Prophetic Life, between things seen and done

in vision only, and things done in fact," and another, "On the two Millennial Theories," add something to the worth of the book. On the whole, for ministers—who in this age of public activity have but little time critically to examine the text and the original for themselves—and also for enlightened private students of God's Book, this work will prove invaluable. We heartily commend it to their attention, and thank the author for it. E. B. H.

Helena's Household. A Tale of Rome in the First Century. 12mo., pp. 422. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The narrative in this volume opens with the approach of St. Paul to Rome in charge of Julius the centurion, and in company with Luke and the Christians who had come as far as Appii Forum and Tres Tabernæ to meet them. Helena, a spiritual Athenian woman, who had in her youth been taught with her brother Cineas in the philosophy of Plato, is the wife of Labeo, one of the Sulpicii, and, in spirit, a proud representative of the true Roman, who in Britain was the heroic soldier, but whose great heart was devoted to her, and Marcus their little son. Her conversations with Cineas disclose the cravings of her soul for what philosophy could not give, a communion with God, and a consciousness of his interest in her. Cineas delights in his sublime intellectual perceptions of the Deity; but she must know that God loves. The repetition of the Lord's prayer by Marcus, overheard by her, gave the first intimation of the actual fatherhood of God. The child, who had learned from his Christian nurse the story of Jesus, becomes his mother's teacher in the first truths of the Gospel, which like a little child she receives, and in which she finds rest to her soul. No character is more artless or natural than this child, who by his gentle love conquers the brave but barbaric Briton whom his sympathy had delivered from death. The court of Nero, with its vices and infamies, is sufficiently laid open before us to show the central power of all the hate and opposition to Christianity. The hour of persecution comes, and we are led to the catacombs, where Helena and Marcus find a refuge after their escape from prison, and where to-day may be read most sad memorials of those days of suffering. Neither the nervous, sensitive child, nor his mother, ever recovered from the terrible impressions then made; but the triumphant hope of immortality in which they died, proved long afterward a power which drew other souls to the foot of the cross. Cineas, the sorrowing mourner, can find nothing in Plato, or Pindar, or

Æschylus to comfort him. Labeo, disgusted with the court, bereaved of his heart's idols, and utterly disconsolate, finds no peace in arms, no hope in philosophy. The ministry of sorrows drives them to the Man of sorrows, whose ambassadors they afterward become.

It is not an easy literary task to reproduce a picture of a period so different from our own times, and in which so many different and contrary elements are involved; but our author has succeeded to an extent truly gratifying. Isaac, the learned and faithful slave, but bigoted Jew; Hegio, the unprincipled Syrian; Galdus, the Briton, whose sense of justice rewards the treachery of Hegio by contriving his summary execution as a Christian; Julius the centurion, are, with others, characters represented with great accuracy. The volume shows not only an acquaintance with the facts of history, but a penetration into the spirit of the Greek philosophy, and the profounder and more spiritual truths of the Gospel.

D. A. W.

Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D. D., and JAMES STRONG, S. T. D. Vol. i, 8vo., pp. 947. A-B. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

We congratulate the authors and the Church upon the appearance of this first installment of the long promised Cyclopedia. With us the *delay* seems not unreasonably long. There are those who seem to imagine that a thorough commentary or cyclopedia can be rolled off by the author, in addition to other multifarious labors, as rapidly and as easily as by the reader. But the witty Sheridan once well remarked that "easy reading is terribly hard writing." The rail-track without a jar to the rider, is a result of mighty labor as well as of exact science by the layer. Let us "learn to labor, and to wait" for those who labor. Meanwhile we hope that there may be no failure to complete a work whose opening promises so largely, nor failure of success with the public after completion.

The attainment of a perfect sacred encyclopedia must be the cumulative result of the many successive attempts of many successive laborers. Each successor must select, add to, and complete the labors of its predecessor. The *finale*, so far as such a thing can be reached, must be, so to speak, *all-embracing*. The sacred scholar needs but one religious cyclopedia in his library, and that should yield him always the thing he can properly inquire for. A simply biblical encyclopedia, that tells nothing of theology, a biblico-theological dictionary that gives no ecclesiastical history or sacred

biography, will not serve. Such separation renders too many books necessary. Hence Drs. M'Clintock and Strong have done wisely in giving us a complete Thesaurus for the library of every minister and Christian scholar. It is a grand step beyond any previously completed attempt in the language.

The work is *fairer* than any previous work of the kind. Our Calvinistic brethren will doubtless pronounce it one-sided, in sad forgetfulness that it but restores the balance from an old one-sidedness. It takes in a large amount of English and American matter of which Germany is ignorant. The one-sidedness of Hertzog may be recognized by looking at his treatment of the great men on the opposite sides of the Arminian discussion, in which, for instance, the reader will look in vain for the great name of Curcellæus. The present writers may have carried their introduction of clerical names and biographies perhaps questionably far, but they have been unquestionably impartial.

The great merits of the work, its great utility to our ministers, require that it should be amply sustained. It must specially be sustained by our own Church. It will be in itself a minister's library.

The present work will be the subject of a future Quarterly article.

A New Translation of Job, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles. With Introductions and Notes, chiefly explanatory. By GEORGE R. NOYES, D.D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew, and Dexter Lecturer in Harvard University. Third edition, carefully revised, with additional notes. 12mo., pp. 351. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1867.

A New Translation of the Book of Psalms, and of the Proverbs. With Introductions and Notes, chiefly explanatory. By GEORGE R. NOYES, D. D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew, etc., and Dexter Lecturer in Harvard University. Third edition, 12mo., pp. 421. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1867.

Dr. Noyes's fine volumes are to us an adumbration how much might be done, and how much is not done, by our Old Testament scholars, in bringing out the holy classics in their own true beauty before the Christian public. He gives to sacred scholarship much of the attractiveness of elegant literature. His work is done, of course, from the Rationalistic standpoint; but it is well for us to see what at its best estate that standpoint can furnish. His expositions are underlaid with no doctrinal depth, and inspired with very little evangelic spirit, being below the spiritual level of either the Jewish or the Christian Church. And yet to our ministry, so small a minority of whom study the inspired originals,

we strongly recommend these volumes as special aids in bringing the mind to a clear appreciation of the real nature of the old Hebrew records.

Dr. Noyes is neither obtrusive nor dogmatical in the statement of his views. The great body of his translation is unaffected by their peculiarity, and might have been written by a Methodist scholar. Generally, where the passage requires it, he rather states the different views than argues either. He sees no Messiah in the Psalms; no Christ, we suppose, in the Old Testament. To our view, if Christ is not in the Old Testament there is no Christ at all. We suppose that "Jesus, who is called Christ," knew a great deal better than any of us the meaning of the Old Testament prophecy; and if Jesus, even after his resurrection, (Luke xxiv, 44-47,) did not find himself in the prophets and the psalms, then the New Testament is a very unreliable book, and Christianity as therein taught contains a great deal more falsehood than truth. So it appears to us; perhaps not so to Dr. Noyes; and if his piety finds its best nutriment in his thin system, it is no wish of ours to quench the smoking flax. Thus much, however, we may say, that however alimentary it may be to his spiritual taste, it could exert little power over the secular body, and would possess no self-sustaining vitality amid the surging deluge of a sensual age. The left wing of Unitarianism is at this hour proclaiming the practicability of a true piety in Atheism.

American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and Edited by Professor H. B. HACKETT, D. D., with the co-operation of Mr. EZRA ABBOT, A. M., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. 8vo., pp. 221. Nos. 1 and 2. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

Biblical scholars will gladly welcome the issue of an American edition of Smith's valuable Dictionary of the Bible, edited by so accomplished a scholar as Dr. Hackett, from the press of Hurd & Houghton. The work, as first published, distanced all its English rivals, and as republished in America is a great improvement upon the English edition. It is more judiciously arranged, an immense mass of corrections have been made, illustrations from late Oriental researches have been incorporated, new articles have been furnished, fuller recognition of American scholars and works has been made. The results of the very latest researches are gathered. Among the American contributors to the present edition we find Conant, Schaff, Shedd, H. B. Smith, W. F. Warren, and President Wolsey. Dr. Hackett's notes are numerous and valuable. It will be published by subscription, medium octavo size, in monthly numbers

of one hundred and twelve pages each. It is doubtless the best purely biblical dictionary published.

We note the following passage on the Adamic name:

The generic term Adam, man, becomes in the case of the first man a *denominative*. Supposing the Hebrew language to represent accurately the primary ideas connected with the formation of man, it would seem that the appellation bestowed by God was given to keep alive in Adam the memory of his mortal nature; whereas the name by which he preferred to designate himself was Ish, a man of substance or worth. (Gen. ii, 23.)

The Christ of the Apostles' Creed the Voice of the Church against Arianism, Strauss, and Renan. With an Appendix by Rev. W. A. SCOTT, D. D. Pastor of the Forty-second-street Church, New York. 12mo., pp. 432. Anson D. F. Randolph. 1867.

Dr. Scott here furnishes that view of Christ maintained by the New Testament Church from the first advent to the second. Infidels and Rationalists can frame what fancy sketches they please; the gospels, the epistles, and the primitive creed furnish the data, trusting to which the Church of the faithful feels no difficulty in finding her Lord. Dr. Scott makes use of the great expounders of the creed, Witsius, Pearson, and others, yet shapes and modifies the whole with an independent mind. Some defects of method and style in these lectures arise from their pulpit origin. They are better adapted to inform and confirm the believer than to battle and baffle the thorough-bred skeptic. But the inquiring and intelligent Christian will find profit in their study.

Dr. Scott quotes from Sir William Rowan Hamilton an ingenious suggestion that our Lord was ten days in ascending to the highest heaven. His body moved through *space* and required *time*, as we see by its gradually receding from the eyes of the apostles. It went from one spot, the hill of Bethany, to another spot, where it now is. What was the amount of time in this passage through space from point to point? We know, at any rate, that the Spirit was not to be sent until his full ascension, and we know that it was just ten days after that the Spirit was sent; that is, ten days from the Ascension to the Pentecost.

Out of Harness. Sketches, Narrative and Descriptive. By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D. Crown 8vo., pp. 388. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The same beautiful simplicity and tender pathos which so strongly characterize former volumes of Dr. Guthrie are conspicuous in these sketches. His earnest, affectionate nature, his generous sympathy with every movement for Christ and humanity, his

large and noble charity, are impressed upon every page. The style is peculiarly his own. It is so easy and conversational that we almost forget that we hold a printed book in our hand, and seem to hear the author speaking, and to see the very things which he describes, whether it be the "Winter Gale" at Brighton, the Methodist "Watchnight" at Edinburgh, or the dying scene of the "Unforgiving and Unforgiven."

Though Dr. Guthrie is one of Scotland's most brilliant preachers, his soul, as was Chalmers's, is burdened with the condition of the ignorant and heathen masses that swarm in large cities. The first five or six years of his ministry in Edinburgh were chiefly devoted to that class of the population. Several of the sketches in the present volume introduce us to scenes in his labors in the Cowgate, which may serve to shed light upon the problem now forcing itself upon Christian minds in our own land respecting the evangelization of the same class in our midst. Chalmers, Guthrie, and Hanna, personally engaging in such lowly ministry, become an example to all Christian people of every land and name.

*Foreign Theological Publications.**

Reden an Geistliche aus der Kirchlichen Gegenwart. Elf Conferens vorträge in den Jahren 1860-1865 gehalten. Von Dr. LOUIS BERNHARD RÜLING, Pastor Primarius zu Budissin. Hierzu als Anhang drei Aussprachen an Junglinge. 8vo., pp. 275. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1866.

THE author's concluding words of introduction indicate the spirit of his volume: "There is no other salvation, either for the Church, the State, the school, the people, the family, or the individual soul, than in Jesus Christ!" The work consists of addresses delivered on public occasions, mostly pastoral conferences. While a number of the topics are of interest to the German public only, the most are of almost universal application in Protestant Christendom. Dr. Rüling has charge of a large parish, including about ten thousand souls; and since his volume is chiefly made up of discussions immediately or remotely connected with the Church in its manifold relations, his statements are entitled to careful consideration. He speaks in the light of his own experience, and his words are therefore doubly valuable. Several of the addresses have previously

* Our notices of German publications, which have hitherto been furnished by Dr. WARREN, will now come from the pen of Dr. J. F. HURST, of Bremen, author of the "History of Rationalism."

appeared in the homiletical journal, *Gesetz und Zeugnis*, but the most of them are now in print for the first time.

The work is divided into two parts. Part First contains five edifying addresses entitled, Christ is where the Spirit of Truth is; Trowel and Sword; Priest and Samaritan; Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy! How can we make this Church Conference a Holy-rod day? Part Second is occupied altogether by lectures of a higher literary order, bearing the following titles: On the Preaching required by the Times; On the Relations of the Divorce Question to Church and State; On the Relation of the School to the Church; Church or Congregation? Lutheran Observations on the Jubilee Celebration of the Heidelberg Catechism; On the Moral Condition of the Rural Population of Germany. Besides these there is an appendix, comprising three stirring addresses to young people.

The standpoint of Dr. Rüling is thoroughly orthodox, we may say *earnestly evangelical*. His lecture on the "Preaching required by the Times" is a clarion note for a higher style of pulpit ministration than Germany has been favored with for many a long, dark year. Taking up the question at the outset, "What must we preach?" he says: "God's word is our reason, and not merely by fragments but as a whole, for God's word is a unit. Here we all unite; Christ is the whole Divine Word, and therefore the prophecy concerning Christ has its fulfillment in Christ; as well the school-master leading us to Christ, as the grace and truth revealed in Christ, the *whole* Christ; that is, not merely his synoptical but his Johannine form; not merely as he is reflected in Paul, but as he is reflected in Peter and James. The *whole* Christ; not merely the type, but the Redeemer; not only the Crucified, but the Risen One; not only the Prophet, but the King; not only the Man, but the God-Man!" Laying down his basis for preaching in these words, the author next describes *the necessity of preaching in such a way as the times require*, or else a large number of sermons must fail in application. Not that the Gospel should be wrested from its original shape to conform to the changes of human society, but that the method of its presentation be such as can best suit the people who hear it. In order to warn young ministers against falling beneath the dignity of their office, he calls to mind the sad case of Töschner, who preached the whole of the year 1722 on the Sovereignty of God; celebrated the first Sunday after Advent by a discourse on The Multitude of People on the Earth; third Sunday after Advent, by one on Remarkable Prospects and Views; Epiphany, by one on The Stars; second Sunday after Epiphany,

by one on Merrymaking and Masquerades; Palm Sunday, by one on All Kinds of Accidents; Easter, by one on the Growth of Plants; and on another easter day by a discourse on Remarkable Journeys. Carpzov and his successor used to enlighten their congregations by sermons on Christ as the best mechanic, the best cloth-maker, the best linen-weaver, the best lantern-maker. The preaching which Ruling would have is derived immediately from the Holy Scriptures, and is aimed directly at the heart, for its conviction, regeneration, and final salvation. We have never met in the German language a more fitting word on the diction of a preacher of the Gospel; and in transferring it, our regret is that we cannot present whole pages of the lecture for the special attention of the clerical readers of the *Quarterly*. "There should be few rules," says the doctor; "a character pervaded by Christ will certainly be able to find its diction. This style suits one, that another. I cannot prescribe much for you. I would not dare to try to speak like Harms, or Krummacher, or Ahlfeld. . . . Then I should cease to be a preacher and become a comedian. The one Gospel contains the greatest variety of expression, and we only know one general rule: that God wishes to speak through our mouth, *θεωπρέπω*. . . . It is God's people whom we have before us. Let us rely in the main on the promise that 'it shall be given us,' not merely *τί*, but also *πῶς λαλήσομεν*; but we should remember that not only internal and external oratorical organs, not only understanding and memory, mouth and hand, but the *whole man*, belong to the *πῶς*. The great thing, not merely for our day but for *all times*, still stands; wherever the Gospel is preached in the world, the preacher himself and his entire family are constantly preaching. *The life may edify without the preached word, but the preached word can never avail without the life too.* The preacher who in our time will accomplish anything—in a time which points its finger directly at the preacher—must be faultless in doctrine, irreproachable in life; he must not only be learned, he must also be converted; he must not only be *vocatus*, but also *renatus*. Without this attribute the best preaching amounts to nothing. If the preacher himself amounts to nothing, then his eloquence is *no* virtue. It must be said of us, as it was said of Basil the Martyr, 'His preaching was like thunder, because his life was the lightning that belonged to it;' or, as it was said of the Reformers, 'The truth not only thundered, but it blazed forth from themselves.'"

This whole lecture, together with two or three more in the valuable work of Dr. Ruling, are richly deserving an English translation. But as they were all called forth by the exigencies surround-

ing the German Church, as well as by many within it, we would rather know that the volume has a wide circle of readers in Germany than to hear of its appearance in an English dress. It is a worthy representative of the vigorous efforts, now happily multiplying, toward spiritual renovation; and as such we wish it great success.

Predigten über die Epistolischen Perikopen. Von Dr. FRIEDRICH AHLFELD, Pastor zu St. Nicolai in Leipzig. 8vo., pp. viii, 730. Halle: Muhlmann. 1867.

A bulky volume of sermons by one of the most celebrated preachers in Germany. He makes no attempt to disguise the real character of his book by giving it some name likely to lead people to think that it had never before been preached, as is now the custom in Scotland, and to some extent in the United States. It does not require a minute's time to discover the character of the book, for plain "Sermons" stands on the title-page. Sixteen years ago Dr. Ahlfeld published a volume of sermons on the Gospels, and he pleads two excuses for issuing the present one on the Epistles. The *first* is, that in the space of sixteen years he has learned a great many lessons on the care of souls and the life of the Church; the *second* is the old story of the wish of friends having had much to do with the publication of the present work. In the volume there are seventy-two sermons in all, the length of each being much shorter than most American sermons. The titles are very attractive, and might be called by severe critics fanciful, if not sometimes puerile. We give a few as specimens: The Second Leaf in the Christian's School-Book, (Rom. xiii, 8-10;) The Best Path to the New Year lies through Bethlehem, (Gal. iii, 23-29;) The Love born of the Lord is the most beautiful Flower in Christian Life, (1 Cor. xiii, 1-13;) Isaiah the first plain Christmas Messenger, (Isaiah vii, 10-16;) Three Days from Life, (John vi, 67-69, and Luke xxii, 54-62;) The Wonder Ways of the Holy Ghost, (Acts ii, 1-13;) The true Medicine to drive off the Bitterness and Danger of Sorrow, (1 Pet. v, 6-11;) A Harvest Wreath for God's Honor, (Deut. viii, 7-18.)

It would be rash to judge from such titles that the sermons which follow them are mere appeals for attention and applause. Just the reverse. The volume abounds in startling incidents, such as a large parish always furnishes; in plain and concise statements of Christian doctrine; in searching exhortation to the sleeping soul; in beautiful and touching descriptions of Christian life; and in that true pathos which is derived from a humble contempla-

tion of the Cross, and reliance on Him whose death it symbolizes. In comparing this last fruit of Dr. Ahlfeld's pulpit labors with some of his previous ones we find it in advance of them all. Take, for example, his method of division. In previous sermons he frequently adopted a rhythmical style, and sometimes at the expense of good thought as well as by doing violence to the text itself. From a volume published as late as 1860 we select his plan of a sermon on "What sort of an Impression did the first Christmas Sermon make?" (Luke ii, 15-20.) If we were to translate the heads we would of course have to destroy the meter. In answer to the question of the text they run thus:

1. Sie suchen das Kindlein in Kripp'und stall,
2. Sie breiten das Wort aus überall,
3. Sie loben Gott mit fröhlichen Schall.

Another specimen of a sermon metrically divided. The topic is, "What do you see on the Cross of Christ?" (Luke xxiii, 24-47.) The answer, containing all the divisions, is:

1. Die Liebe, die um uns wirbt,
2. Die Liebe, die für uns stirbt,
3. Die Liebe, die nie verdirbt.

We are glad to say that such a fantastic method of analyzing is rarely, if at all, adopted in this latest work of Dr. Ahlfeld. But yet we cannot say much for his skill in grasping the whole truth of a passage of Scripture. His treatment is too often one-sided. The only range of thought he gives to a sermon on Patience is to tell simply what patience does: 1. It does not desire empty honor; 2. It helps the fallen brother; 3. It bears his burden. Many a young Methodist itinerant, just entering the work of the ministry, could make a more comprehensive division than that one. As more favorable specimens of division we may name the following: Sermon on Rom. vi, 19-23, divided thus: 1. The Different Masters; 2. The Different Services; 3. The Different Rewards. Sermon on 1 Thess. iv, 13-18, thus divided: 1. He Awakens the Dead; 2. He Clothes the Living with a new Body; 3. He takes them all with him into the Kingdom of his Glory. We do not know a work which gives a fairer exhibition of the better class of sermons preached in the evangelical pulpits of Germany than this one; though we do not mean to place it beside those of Krummacher, Tholuck, and some others that we might name, in profundity of thought, or in that many-sided view of a subject for which Wesley, and in a less degree, Chalmers, were distinguished. The sermons of Dr. Ahlfeld have been read by tens of thousands, and we can only wish for the present and best volume that he has ever pub-

lished that it may be even more useful than its predecessors in awakening and edifying those for whom Christ has died.

Bibel und Natur. Vorlesungen über die Mosaische Urgeschichte und ihr Verhältniss zu den Ergebnissen der Naturforschung. Von Dr. F. HEINRICH REUSCH, Prof. der Theologie an der Universität zu Bonn. Zweite umgearbeitete Auflage. Freiburg in Breisgau. 1866.

The question whether the Bible and science are opposed to each other has provoked much earnest discussion in late years. The work of Professor Reusch is from a Roman Catholic point of view, but it possesses an interest and value to the Protestant mind. It is an attempt to show that the so-called opposition between science and revelation is not real, but purely fanciful; and that the authority of the Scriptures, as a divine revelation, has never been shaken, and never can be disturbed by scientific investigation. The author goes through his apologetic undertaking with an earnest spirit, having adopted as his plan an explanation of that part of the Bible which is usually claimed by skeptics to be in most violent opposition to the results of science. He lays down as the basis of his discussion this principle: "The supernatural revelation has never the purpose of enriching our profane knowledge; therefore the Bible has nowhere the purpose of giving us strictly scientific information." In proof of this position a series of testimonies of both Protestant and Catholic writers is adduced with great force. But the professor does not take a depreciative view of the labors of eminent scientific investigators; in fact, the sections in "The Task of Natural Science," and "Natural Science and Faith not Enemies," are abundant in tributes to their eminent services. But at the same time he will not concede to natural science the least right to dictate on the subject of religious truth.

Fourteen lectures are devoted to the creation, and we find them pregnant with much astronomical, geological, and paleontological information. We then come to the no less valuable and interesting portion in which the deluge, the question of the origin of species, and the unity and antiquity of the human race are examined. The position which the professor assigns to the enumeration of days in the first chapter of Genesis is at least striking and novel. It is *his* method of adjusting the apparent age of the world with the claims of geology in its present stage. "The whole number of days," says he, "has no other purpose than to prepare for the first verse of the second chapter, 'and God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it;' the divine six days' work and the consequent divine Sabbath on the one side, and the week (the six

days of labor) and the Sabbath on the other, constitute a parallel. The creation week is the divine type; our week is the human copy." The religious-ethical purpose of the creation narrative is proved by the following method: "If we ask," says the author, "how long was each one of these days?" then does the Bible send us off with a simple rebuff, such as, "You are a creature of God, and you should honor your Creator by ceasing on the seventh day from all your earthly labor and business. After God had created he ceased to create; and so should you, after you have labored, cease to labor."

We regard the book of Professor Reusch as least valuable in its method of adjusting the Mosaic account of creation to the geological periods. He here fails to do strict justice to the canons of Biblical criticism; but in other respects, in its groupings of scientific results, in its good purpose, in the standpoint which it occupies, and as a real advance in this important field of inquiry, it is well worthy of all the warm commendation it has already received at the hands of the evangelical press of Germany.

Die Bedeutung der Weltschöpfung nach Natur und Schrift. Von M. WOLFF.
Frankfurt am Main: Heyder und Zimmer. 1866.

Another elaborate effort to make Scripture and science agree on the Mosaic account of creation. The author is convinced that if Christian faith in the biblical record be shaken, then will faith in the whole Biblical history and doctrine of redemption be destroyed. He attempts to answer two prominent objections of natural science: the first of which is *geological*, that the earth must have been in existence through very long periods; the second is *astromical*, that the numberless stars of the immeasurable planetary world must have long existed as lights of the earth. He meets the first charge by letting the history of the earth's formation, demanded by geology, precede the six days' work of Scripture, and does not allow that the six days were long periods. He answers the second by distinguishing between heaven, in verse 1, and the firmament, (*rakiah*), which receives (verse 8) the additional name of heaven. The firmament is not "created" as the heaven in verse 1; but is "made," that is, from materials already in existence and at hand. It is "the heaven of air and ether," which has the power of refining, and can therefore give water over the *rakiah*; that is, water which shall be borne up in airy and gaseous forms, and can give water under the *rakiah*, which appears on the earth as dew and rain. In this firmament the heavenly lights

(verse 4) appear; and by this the author understands the solar system as different from the illimitable system of the planets which he finds mentioned in Job xxxviii, 4, sqq. This is the finished world, dwelling of angels, God's throne "in the light," the heaven of our solar system, which includes our earth as a member. The great objection which we make to Mr. Wolff's work is, that it is an attempt to make Moses teach much more than he designed to teach in his record of the creation. It is an exaggeration of his purpose. In the Scriptural account there is not, which Mr. Wolff contends there is, "a hieroglyphical character and real lapidary style." Scripture loses its force when undue attempts are made to make certain parts teach that for which they were never intended. But to give an example on this point from the book before us, the author says, (p. 3,) "The germ of the later history of redemption lies buried in the mysterious beginning, and the later history of redemption is the development of this germ. It is alone by this later history of redemption that the secret beginning can be clearly known. . . . It is not sufficient to carefully prove a harmony between the Bible and natural science, for by this means we only show that the Bible also possesses a correct scientific knowledge." On page 40 the author attempts to prove that the history of the creation authenticates the doctrine of the Trinity; and on page 22 he tries to show that there is a real parallel between the history of our solar system and the history of humanity. On pp. 80, sqq., the six days' work is made to possess a symbolical-prophetical signification for the history of the kingdom of God. As an attempt to do justice to this section of sacred history as the record of inspiration, the work of Mr. Wolff deserves credit; but he must not flatter himself that the reasoning which he has adopted to solve the problem of the apparent antagonism between the Mosaic record and natural science has contributed materially to the desired result.

Was ist die Wahrheit von Jesu? Zeitfrage und Bekenntniss, von HERRICH KÖNIG. Pp. 208. Leipzig: Brockhaus. 1867.

AN attempt to settle the christological question so fully that it can never be raised again. But Mr. König has utterly failed in his effort. He has traveled over the whole ground from man's fall, nay, as far back as the most venturesome geologist's remotest date, down to Baur and the Tübingen school, and yet he has not given the world any valuable fruit of his long journey. His book is divided into three parts. Part First gives the standpoint, The Question and The Confession. Part Second (from the Ante-

Christian World) is divided into nine chapters, thus: Nature and History; Man; The Nations; Revelation; Deity; Priests; Types; Discussion on Pilgrims; and Palestine. Part Third (On Christianity) treats, in its eleven chapters, of Jesus Christ; His Advent; Birth; School; Personality; Development of Life; Legacy; Divisions; Paul; The Gospels; and Unity.

We have examined this work with some care in order to find out what the author designs to prove, though he had led us to understand that he purposed to tell us "the truth about Jesus." But when he says that the evangelists do not agree, but really contradict each other in their accounts of the birth of Christ, we conclude that his own attempt will hardly stand the test beside theirs. His work is rather diffuse, somewhat confused, lacks originality; and, while it will do no good, will as surely do but little harm. It will soon find its place among the unread books of the antiquarian booksellers of Germany.

♦ ♦ ♦

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Annual of Scientific Discovery: or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1866 and 1867. Exhibiting the Most Important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Zoology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc. Together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the Years 1865 and 1866; A List of Recent Scientific Publications, Obituaries of Eminent Scientific Men, etc. Edited by SAMUEL KNEELAND, A. M., M. D., Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Secretary of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, etc. New York: Sheldon & Co.

Mr. Wells, the former editor of this work, which has run so successful a career for the last fifteen years, having been appointed commissioner of the national revenue, a new editor appears, and the present volume sums up the scientific results for two years instead of one. From the greater length of the period from which the selections are made, and the great importance of the scientific advances made, the present volume possesses rather an increased than diminished interest.

First, the return of peace has diminished the amount of pages describing the products of human genius in its most terrible phase, as the artificer of the means of destruction. In the contest between the arts of attack and of defense, the advantage just now is on the side of the former, the steel projectiles and chilled shot demanding an improved machinery of resistance. The useful

mechanic arts have made some new achievements, both in invention and in the accomplishment of great works. The doctrine of the correlation of forces has gained ground. New views have opened in regard to the relations between light, heat, electricity, magnetism, and their common relation to motion. The spectrum analysis is pouring a flood of light upon the structure of the heavenly bodies. Microscopical and chemical investigations in physiology develop the fact of a similar ultimate cellular system in both vegetable and animal systems; in "the tough oak plank, the blade of grass, the lion's claw, the contracting muscle, and the thinking brain."

But the topic of highest interest to the popular mind evidently, as well as to the savan and the theologian, is furnished from the departments of geology and biology, namely, regarding the origin and antiquity of man. Mr. Kneeland, like his predecessor, decisively favors the Darwinian theory of species, and his presentation of that subject is not a judicially impartial statement of both sides, but a forensic summation of the arguments on one side.

The theory of Darwin, that species are not rigidly limited, and have not been created at various times complete and unchangeable, but have been gradually and indefinitely varied, from external circumstances, from natural efforts to accommodate themselves to surrounding changes, and from the necessity of yielding to force in the struggle for existence, has continually gained ground, and now numbers among its advocates many of the first naturalists of Europe and this country. The opponents of this theory have their strong points in accommodating definitions of a species, the phenomena of hybridity, and the non-occurrence of these changes before our eyes. If species were created as we now see them, the more we subdivide them by extended observation the more we increase the number of the supposed creations; and yet we have no well-authenticated instance of a new creation, and in no other operations of nature such a want of continuity, such a perpetually recurring creative miracle. The tendency seems to be to the belief that there are no such natural divisions as species, genera, families, etc., but that they are merely convenient terms for subdivisions, having a permanence which may outlive many generations of man, and yet which are not absolutely fixed. Such is the length of geological periods now admitted, that the phenomena of hybridity may be legitimately explained on the theory of the continuity of succession; the infecundity may just as well be due to physical differences arising from long-continued variation, as to an original organic constitution; indeed, the acknowledged degrees of hybridity are best explained on Darwin's theory. Darwin insists upon time for the changes by natural selection; and no one will pretend, at the present day, to date back the earth's history only a few thousand years. Geology teaches that hundreds of thousands of years do not limit the period of the earth's existence as an abode for living organisms. In the early days of geological science, the numerous gaps in the record of fossil forms would have been a strong argument against the theory of Darwin; certain species seemed to become extinct and new ones to appear without connecting links; but, as page after page of this geological record has been discovered, the gaps become less numerous and less abrupt, and the intermediate forms are gradually being added to form the continuous series. The more the gaps between species are filled up by the discovery of intermediate varieties, the stronger becomes the argument for transmutation, and the weaker that for successive creations; because the former view then becomes more and more consistent with

experience, and the latter more and more inconsistent with it. The investigations of Mr. Bates on the butterflies of the Amazon region, of Mr. Wallace on those of the Malay Archipelago, of Mr. B. D. Walsh on the effect of food in insects; Sir John Lubbock's diving hymenopterous insect; the discovery of Eozoon at a period inconceivably antecedent to the pre-supposed introduction of life upon the globe; the published opinions of De Candolle and Hooker in botany; the phases of resemblance to inferior orders which the embryo goes through in its development; the metamorphosis of plants, and the occurrence of rudimentary and useless organs; all supply strong evidence in favor of the derivative hypothesis. The present more quiet and uniform rate of physical changes would involve a greater degree of fixity in living forms than in the earlier periods of rapid transition. It must also be remembered that only a very small portion of the extinct forms have been preserved as fossils; were the series complete, the question would be solved, and, in the opinion of many good judges, most likely in favor of the derivative hypothesis. The opponents of continuity lay all stress upon the lost links of the paleontological chain, and none upon the few existing and altogether exceptional ones; and the worst of it is, that the chance of filling up the missing links, from the operation of destructive causes, is very small. . . . Recent discoveries in paleontology prove that man existed on this earth at a period far anterior to that commonly assigned to him. The chipped flints of the earliest races show that their condition was not that of civilization; to these rude implements succeeded more carefully shaped and polished stone weapons, then bronze was used, and, the last before the historic period, iron. Civilization, even to the extent of that of the Egyptians and the Central Americans, must have been of very slow growth; as invention is said to march with a geometrical progression, the earliest steps must have been exceedingly slow.

Time is the great element, both in the development of vegetable and animal life, and also in the progress of man from barbarism to civilization; and this must be a primary idea in the consideration of the theory of Darwin. In this relation we will conclude by quoting from the inaugural address of Mr. Grove:

"The prejudices of education, and associations with the past, are against this (Darwin's theory of the origin of species by natural selection, etc.), as against all new views; and while, on the one hand, a theory is not to be accepted because it is new and *primâ facie* plausible, still, to this assembly, I need not say that its running counter to existing opinions is not necessarily a reason for its rejection; the *onus probandi* should rest on those who advance a new view, but the degree of proof must differ with the nature of the subject. The fair question is, Does the newly-proposed view remove more difficulties, require fewer assumptions, and present more consistency with observed facts than that which it seeks to supersede? If so, the philosopher will adopt it, and the world will follow the philosopher—after many days." He is strongly in favor of the new theory, disbelieving in *per saltum* or sudden creations, and maintains that continuity is a law of nature, the true expression of the action of Almighty Power, and that we should cease to look for special interventions of the creative act—"we should endeavor from the relics to evoke their history, and, when we find a gap, not try to bridge it over by a miracle."—Pp. 9-11.

There are, in fact, three sects or divisions of opinion among the supporters of the doctrine of "transmutation of species." There is the doctrine of "natural selection" by Darwin, as expounded in his *Origin of Species*. Second, there is the doctrine of evolution, as expounded by Herbert Spencer in his volumes in biology. And, third, are the following views of Prof. Huxley, concisely in fact disproving Darwin's view, and flinging him upon Lamarck's old theory of variation "by external influences."

Much observation must be made, and much evidence accumulated, before we can see our way to a theory of transmutation of species. The only valid, though

cardinal, objection to such a theory, is the want of evidence that a change of the kind inferred really takes place, and that so little proof of it is forthcoming, in spite of the attention which has, for many years, been anxiously directed to the subject. The nearly allied species tantalize us by a certain flexibility of type, and by their near approach to one another; but they seem rigidly to abstain from the boundary lines; and the variations that take place seem to have no special reference to an approximation to those lines, but rather to a certain power of accommodation to external circumstances, necessary for the preservation of the species. We find considerable varieties in the human species. We do not yet clearly know how to connect even these with one another, or with a common origin. Some of these are more, some less, allied to the monkey; but between the lowest of the human and the highest of the monkey there is a gap, the width of which will be differently estimated by different persons, but so wide that there has never yet been any doubt to which side any specimen should be referred. Now, if the one has been transmuted from the other, how comes it that the series has been broken, and the connecting links ceased to exist? The conditions are still favorable to the existence of the man and to the existence of the monkey; why are they not still favorable to existence of the species that have connected the one with the other? We may wonder, not only that the traces of species in past time are not forthcoming, but that the species are not now living. Moreover, we do not know that any conceivable conditions, operating through any number of years, will bring the gorilla or chimpanzee one whit nearer to man, would give them a foot more capable of bearing the body erect, a brain more capable of conceiving ideas, or a larynx more capable of communicating them. He did not think that much direct assistance has been given, by the theory of natural selection based upon the struggle for existence, ably propounded and ably defended as it has been; it has dispersed some of the fallacies and false objections which beset the idea of transmutation of species, and has so placed the question in a fairer position for discussion; but it reminds us forcibly of some of the real difficulties and objections. Though artificial selection may do much to modify species, it is rather by producing varieties than by drawing away very far from the original stock. To the former there seems no limit; but the latter is stopped by the increasing unproductiveness and unhealthiness of the individuals, by the susceptibility to disease, and the tendency to revert to the original type. So that increasing departure requires greatly increasing care; and we do not know that any amount of care and time would be sufficient to produce what might fairly be called a new species. The bringing about any marked change, by nature's selection, is shown to be very hard of proof, and has opposed to its probability the fact that the members of a species which are most unlike have the greatest tendency to pair, and are the most fertile; so that we have here, in addition to the ready reversion of modified breeds to the original stock, a law by which the growth or perpetuation of peculiarities is prevented, and a constancy given to the characters of the species. This law is more striking from its contrast with the bar that exists to the pairing of different species, and the infertility of hybrids. Within a given range, dissimilarity promotes fertility. Beyond that range, it is incompatible with it.

These, and other considerations, have always inclined him to the opinion that modifications of animal type, occurring in nature, are more likely to be the result of external influences operating upon successive generations, influencing their development, their growth, and their maturity, than of "natural selection," and the "struggle for existence."

The slight variability of animal types through long periods, the clear manner in which many of them are worked out from one another, and which increasing investigation seems to render more and more apparent, make the prospect of proving that they are deduced from one another by any of the hitherto supposed processes grow more and more distant, and the feeling arises that there must be some other law at work which has escaped our detection.

Whatever be the law and forces which effect and regulate the evolution of species, they are probably of the same kind as those which are operating in the inorganic world. The orderly and definite manner in which forms and features and specific characters are given and preserved in one instance, may be assumed

to be of the same nature as in the other; and we must probably refer the fixed animal and vegetable types to influences identical with, or similar to, those by which the forms are assigned to crystals, and the stratification is given to rocks; by which the geological epochs have been determined, and the boundaries of our planetary and solar systems have been set. One cannot but think that it may be within the power of man to work out and to comprehend, in some degree at least, the principles by which these breaks in the organic and inorganic worlds, constituting as they clearly do an important feature in the plan of creation, are brought about and regulated.

All these theories will be completely refuted if Agassiz's opinion be sustained, that the entire surface of the continents was once completely enameled with glaciers. The present living system must have been originated since that *universal reign of ice*. The strong objection to this is, that the animal life beneath and above the supposed glacier period is said to be of precisely the same type, thus necessitating the supposition that an immediate re-creation of the same fauna was produced. The question waits further investigation.

Lastly, comes Du Chaillu with his gorilla, which "resembles an exaggerated caricature of a human being." His average size of brain is less than thirty cubic inches, while that of a negro is seventy-five. The gorilla's huge head is little brain and mostly bone. His natural motion is on all fours. Caught old or young, his ferocity is equally untamable. *His* depravity is unquestionably total. He will knock you down if he can while you feed him. So that, howsoever Mr. Huxley may feel toward the gorilla, the gorilla acknowledges no relationship with him.

Of *man* as a distinct nature among living beings, we have truly seen no better exposition than the following sentences by Bishop Payne, addressed to an African Methodist Conference. Both speaker and hearers had some special interest in a comprehensive yet well-defined limitation of manhood.

Mr. Huxley, of England, says that man is nothing more than a higher order of the ape or the chimpanzee. But let me tell you how you may distinguish him. He has a straight [erect] back bone that enables him to look up to heaven. No gorilla can do this—no orang-outang. Man alone can look up to the throne of grace. If he is able to unfold his arms and spread his hands to heaven and say, "Our Father who art in heaven," *he is a man*.

History, Biography, and Topography.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America.
By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. Vol. III. 12mo., pp. 510. New York:
Carlton & Porter. 1867.

The present volume of Dr. Stevens's great work extends from 1792 to 1804. It covers a most important period of founding and

extending the denomination over North America, from the meridian period of Coke and Asbury to the margin of the present generation. We have the primary founders, whose names are traditional and distant; their immediate successors, who were familiar to the eyes of our seniors; and our seniors themselves, who "still live" in the reposeful eve of a noble life. Hence the volume, in spite of some sameness with its predecessors, has a zest of its own. This great history, with much identity has a constantly unfolding variety. Our readers are familiar with our high estimate of it as a whole; this volume is of a piece with the work.

Dr. Stevens inadvertently, we think, calls slavery a "political" question. Such it is not intrinsically; but a domestic, a personal, an ethical, a religious, and properly an ecclesiastical question. The politician, the legislature, the government, may take it into political discussion. So they may any other moral or ecclesiastical question; as temperance, Sabbath-keeping, or profane swearing. In this way during the period of the Reformation *the doctrine of justification by faith* was drawn into *political discussion*. *Election and reprobation* were a political question in Holland in the age of Episcopius. *Episcopacy* has more than once been a political question in England. But the fact that the secular world takes moral or religious questions, like *slavery* or *sabbatism*, into politics, *does not take them from the domain of the Church or the pulpit*. And the Church that undertakes to avoid those great questions, under the pretext of segregating itself from politics, abdicates thereby its high moral duty, and emasculates its own Christian manhood. In no sense transcending her absolute churchly *obligation to condemn sin*, whether committed by a person or a corporation, has the Methodist Episcopal Church ever been "*a political Church*." If she has, then the Church of Wesley and Asbury, the Church of the fathers, from its foundation down at least to 1844, was "*a political Church*,"—*quod absurdum est*.

From her founding by the fathers until the present hour, the relations of the Methodist Episcopal Church to political affairs have been determined by her moral duties. While she has never been silent where public sin was involved, she has ever kept perfectly aloof from all non-ethical political questions, from all partisanship, from all subservient connection with political men or measures. Those at a distance who are taught to believe otherwise are greatly deceived.

The American Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1866. Embracing Political, Civil, Military, and Social Affairs; Public Documents, Biography, Statistics, Commerce, Finance, Literature, Science, Agriculture, and Mechanical Industry. Volume VI. 8vo., pp. 795. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

We regret that the late reception of this valuable historical annual prevents our being able to give it the full notice which is its due. We will merely for the present note that the religious department (furnished by Professor Schem, the most accomplished religious statistician of our day) is enlarged in amount and remarkable for its accuracy.

Belles-Lettres, Classical, and Philological.

Hymns of Faith and Hope. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. New Edition. 12mo., pp. 375. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

A beautiful setting is given by the Carters to these rare jewels of the Kelso pastor. The accomplished scholarship and high poetic power of Dr. Bonar are manifest on every page of the volume. But they alone could not have produced such noble lyrics as are found here. It needed, in addition, a profound acquaintance with the word of God, and a personal experience, in which the truths of that word become engraven upon the heart and incorporated into the life.

Not a few of these hymns are genuine war songs of the Church, full of the shout of battle and anticipation of certain triumph. They remind us of scenes in Dr. Bonar's own Scotland, where in a bloodier warfare men fought for Jesus, and from the field of conflict mounted up to eternal victory. And then, again, we find the most tender pathos and gentle, loving tones, sweet and soft as an angel's whisper. The author has for many years been familiar with the hymns of the Middle Ages, a few of which out of the many hundreds upon this subject he has published. It is to a conversation held with him on one of the hills near the Holy City, that we are indebted for Dr. Prime's beautiful edition of the old hymn, "O mother dear, Jerusalem." Several translations and imitations are given us in the present volume, but the hymns, which are original, are equally full of hope of the coming joy. At one time it is the sighing of the soul for its eternal rest; at another, the tearful moaning of absence from the Lord; and

again, it is the swelling note of triumphant expectation in full view of the

"City of the pearl-bright portal;
City of the jasper wall;
City of the golden pavement;
Seat of endless festival:
City of Jehovah, Salem,
City of eternity."

D. A. W.

The Poetical Works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Complete Edition. 24mo., pp. 363, green and gilt. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

A diamond edition of a diamond poet: for all suffrages agree in crowning Longfellow with laureate honors. In his earlier days the wide sweep of scholarship through which his muse coursed, his appropriation of topics and styles from the literature of every clime, inspired the suspicion that he was rather a σοφός than a ποιητής; rather an inspired reproducer of others' melodies than an originator of his own—a splendid bird with a throat to let. But bring his productions, as here, into a total, and not only are we obliged to admire his world-wide compass, but to acknowledge that there is a rich originating fountain within him, and that the play of his genius is as varied as the range of his mastery of literature. So cheery a spirit, so perfect a freedom from misanthropies and bitter skepticisms, so inborn a sympathy with the beautiful and the sacred, such startling jets and novel felicities of phrase and thought, entitle him to the hearty homage of our age. His is no infidel temper. With the pieties of the Christian ages his *poetic faith*, at least, sympathizes. It may be—we know not—that with that same piety essentially brought into the realities of the present day he would acknowledge no fellowship. Yet dealing with the poet, and unknowing the man, we may say that the pure and the good may rejoice to rank this beautiful volume among the most beautiful gifts with which living genius has dowered our age.

Periodicals.

The Atlantic Monthly. May, 1867.

What right has a Magazine to arrogate the name that belongs to the great ocean? Is Mag a salt water animal; or does she assert, like Britannia, the dominion of the sea; or does she claim to be a

broad oceanic concern; or is it maintainable that America has more proprietorship of the *term* Atlantic than Europe? Whatever was the real reason with our Boston neighbors, the last was undoubtedly the *best* one. For in truth the *term* primordially belongs to our continent rather than to the ocean. It is the water and not the land which has *filched* the name. Early at least as Plato is the record that a western continent beyond sea existed whose name was Atlantis; and the ocean received its name doubtless as the trackless medium to that legendary land. Hence, should our reconstructed nation assume the unitary title ATLANTIS, there would be but the restoration of a name as well as of a nation. And, perhaps, the original assumption of a national name, as a symbol of our unity, would have prevented the popularity of the denationalizing doctrine of secession and the consequent civil war. At any rate our Boston friends were right in assuming the adjective Atlantic as the synonym of American—if they did so.

No American monthly has attained so high a literary success as the "Atlantic." Seldom has its literary superior appeared in English literature. We must confine our commendations, however, to its literary character. It counts a constellation of brilliant writers, but all of a certain sectarian hue. There is a quite as brilliant and an immensely longer catalogue of writers who never appear; some of whom we believe to be excluded because of not quite the true shade. *It is gayly, flippantly, contemptuously, exclusively rationalistic.* It is doing its fearful share in feeding the levity of the age, in loosening the ties of moral obligation, in plunging the national mind into a mental and moral chaos. So far as unbridled skepticism and rampant licentiousness become the characteristics of the coming age, those effects may be largely attributed to the religious or rather irreligious literature of which the "Atlantic" is a pre-eminent specimen. If the coming age be morally rescued it will be by the blessed counter influences which it is the polemic aim of this magazine to destroy.

In the first article of the present number Oliver Wendell Holmes, (to whom we are indebted for many a gem of true poetic thought) spreads out before the public mind a broad picture of an evangelical minister's attempts at seducing the young females of his parish. The psychological process is traced with infinitesimal minuteness in the ministerial mind. In preparing his sermons his soul is described as overcome with licentious animal excitement. The scenes of seduction, and the ecstatic half religious half amorous dialogue, are given. But his plans are defeated by the warning interposition of a fine old rationalist, who hates and curses the doc-

trines of the puritanic pulpit. Of course the gay Voltairian doctor, being an autocrat, can have it all his own way, especially at his own breakfast table! But other *tables* will freely inquire whether it is not to that same stern, puritanic pulpit that the unparalleled sexual purity of New England life in former days was not mainly due; and whether the advance of a giddy, flippant irreligion or semi-religion of the Wendell Holmes theological school is ever likely to shed a deeper purity on our social life? We are not puritan. Against some of the dogmas of the old Calvinistic school we ever enter our protest in the name of the inspired word of God; but infinitely would we prefer the sternest puritanism, which, at any rate, was a most deep and earnest *religion*, to this flashy rationalism, which makes but an equivocal pretence to being any religion at all. Dr. Holmes's theology, or rather "atheology," is epicurism. It is the theology of license. It leads to that moral condition of the public in which even marriage becomes "the sacrament of adultery." And we must frankly say that the chapters before us from his pen, taken in their full purport and purpose, are an atrocious libel to a most demoralizing end—an unequivocal *outrage!*

Some years since our autocrat told us in a very witty poem that such had been the damaging effects of some of his most desperate witticisms that he has never since dared to "be as witty as he can." We fear that this was either a poetic figment or a matter of broken resolution; for it seems to us that in every page, in every sentence, in every line, he tries his utmost strain to be witty as he can. His success is often admirable. His style is often brilliant to the highest degree of finish. At other times, as in the present case, he is rather smutty than witty. His wit is often far fetched and overstrained; and sometimes when he is to the utmost as witty as he is able, he is not half so witty as he evidently imagines.

To the Wendell Holmes school, and to Mr. Holmes himself, indeed, truth seems not a very sacred thing. He reminds us of the unscrupulous spirit of the old French encyclopedists. In his "Currents and Counter-currents" Mr. Holmes expressly and largely expounds the doctrine that a physician should violate truth for the good of his patient. When a sick person inquires of his physician what are his prospects of life or death, the doctor must be governed not by the laws of truth, but by the probable effect upon the patient's health. A sick man, a dying man, therefore, has a doubtful chance of obtaining a true answer to the most solemn of all questions from a doctor of the Holmes school. We most promptly say that we

want none of either the morals or medicines of such prescribers. Especially, at the last solemn hour, let no such professional liar approach *our* dying bed!

Pamphlets.

A Vindication of the Claim of Alexander M. Ball, of Elizabeth, New Jersey, to the Authorship of the Poem, "Rock me to Sleep, Mother." By O. A. MORSE, of Cherry Valley, New York. With an Introductory Note from Luther R. Marsh. 12mo., pp. 72. New York: M. W. Dodd.

Mrs. Akers published the song "Rock me to Sleep, Mother," in a volume of her poems issued by Ticknor and Fields, and avers that she wrote it in Italy in 1860. The friends of Mr. Ball testify that he read that song, being part of a poem thrice as long, to them in 1856. As the evidence now stands they make a very clear case. The honor of Mrs. Akers is, however, saved by a psychological theory which may do very passably in the present instance, but would not be very safe to adopt in our courts.

Miscellaneous.

The Centenary Group. By C. C. Goss. New York. 1867.

The nearest semblance of a Centenary monument we have had opportunity to record is this fine pictorial. Around Wesley for a nucleus Mr. Goss has placed the photographic images of two hundred American Methodist celebrities, lay and cleric, dead and living, in concentric ellipses enlarging chronologically, until the outermost rim is composed of the men of the hour. While the style of the art is good, the accuracy of the likenesses, so far as an extensive acquaintance with the originals enables us to pronounce, is attained with remarkable success. Our Church is obliged to Mr. Goss for the enthusiastic energy with which he has secured to her memory forever so faithful a presentment of so large a number of her historic characters. The eyes of another century will gaze with interest upon this tablet. As neither botch nor sham, it may be heartily commended to the patronage of our public.

- Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever.* A Poem, in Twelve Books. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon. 12mo., pp. 447. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.
- Homespun; or, Five and Twenty Years Ago.* By THOMAS LACKLAND. 12mo., pp. 346. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.
- The Word.* The House of Israel. By the Author of "Wide, Wide World." 12mo., pp. 504. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.
- The Calm Hour.* By L. M. M., Author of "The Fountain Sealed." 12mo., pp. 253. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.
- An Elementary Treatise on American Grape Culture and Wine Making.* By PETER B. MEAD. Illustrated with nearly Two Hundred Engravings, drawn from Nature. 8vo., pp. 483. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.
- The History of Pendennis: His Fortunes and Misfortunes, and his greatest Enemy.* By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. With Illustrations by the Author. Two volumes complete in one. 12mo., pp. 372. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.
- Black Sheep.* A Novel. By EDMUND YATES, Author of "Kissing the Rod," "Land at Last," "Broken to Harness," etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.
- Christie's Faith.* By the Author of "Carrie's Confession," etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.
- Bogatzy's Golden Treasury.* 16mo., pp. 384. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.
- Instant Glory.* With a short Biographical Notice of the late Mrs. Winslow. By OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, D.D. 16mo., pp. 125. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.
- The Way of Salvation plainly set forth.* By FREDERICK J. JOBSON, D.D. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter.
- Serious Truths for Consideration.* By FREDERICK J. JOBSON, D.D. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter.
- Visible Union with the Church of Christ.* By FREDERICK J. JOBSON, D.D. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter.
- My Son, give me thine Heart.* An Earnest Appeal to Sinners of all Ages and Classes in Behalf of the Claims of Jesus. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1867.
- Sabbath Chimes; or, Meditations for the Sundays of the Year.* By W. MORLEY PUNSHON, M. A. 16mo., pp. 208. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1867.
- Bible Teaching in Nature.* By the Rev. HUGH MACMILLAN, Author of "First Forms of Vegetation." 12mo., pp. 344. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.
- The Centenary Singer.* A Collection of Hymns and Tunes popular during the last One Hundred Years. Compiled by the Music Committee of the General Conference and Associated Choirs of the M. E. Church for the Sunday-School Union. 16mo., pp. 419. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1867.
- Sowing the Wind.* A Novel. By E. LINN LINTON, Author of "Lizzie Lorton of Greyrigg." 8vo., pp. 145. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Miss Ravenel's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty. By J. W. DE FOREST, Author of "European Acquaintance," "Seacliff," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 521. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Donald Fraser. By the Author of "Bertie Lee." 12mo., pp. 224. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby. By CHARLES DICKENS. With Original Illustrations by S. Eytinge, Jr. 12mo., pp. 472. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

Six Lectures delivered in Exeter Hall from November 1866 to February 1867, at the Request of the Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association. 12mo., pp. 186. London: James Nisbet & Co., Berner-street. Hamilton, Adams, & Co., Paternoster Row. 1867.

Our Father's Business. By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D., Editor of the "Sunday Magazine." 12mo., pp. 278. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The Bankrupt Law of the United States, 1867. With Notes, and a Collection of American and English Decisions upon the Principles and Practice of the Law of Bankruptcy. Adapted to the Use of Lawyer and Merchant. By EDWIN JAMES, of the New York Bar, and one of the Framers of the recent English Bankruptcy Amendment Act. 8vo., pp. 325. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Sunday-School Books.

Our Sunday-School Scrap Book. Edited by Rev. D. WISE, D.D., and Rev. J. H. VINCENT. Pp. 118. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Use of Illustration in Sunday-School Teaching. By Rev. JAMES M. FREEMAN, A.M. Pp. 48. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Blind Basket Maker Library. Four Volumes in a Box, including "Nurse Brame," "The Blind Basket Maker and his Little Daughter," "Charley and Edith," "Little Sue and her Friends." New York: Carlton & Porter.

Postponed for want of room.

Liber Librorum. Scribner & Co.

Lange's Commentary. Scribner & Co.

Bernard's Progress of Scripture Doctrine. Gould & Lincoln.

Dale on Baptizo. Draper & Halliday.

Dall's College, Court, and Market. Lee & Shepard.

Otis's Panama Railroad. Harper & Brothers.